

31st January 1923]

*Kurnool district—cont.*

Name of project.	Remarks.
Sangamesvaram ... ..	The project was abandoned, as it involved the submergence of a considerable area both in the British and in the Nizam's territories and the nature and extent of the country which would be so submerged outweigh any advantage to be gained by the ayacut commanded by the project.

*Cuddapah district.*

Papaghni reservoir ... ..	Gauge readings are being taken to see whether the scheme is worth detailed investigation.
Pullampet reservoir ... ..	Gauge readings have been obtained for a sufficient number of years and a decision has yet to be come to as to whether a detailed investigation of the scheme is warranted.

## II

ACT ASSENTED TO BY HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL.

The hon. the PRESIDENT announced that the Madras City Municipal (Further Amendment) Act, 1922, received the assent of His Excellency the Governor-General on the 20th January 1923.

## III

## COMMUNICATION TO THE COUNCIL.

With reference to the resolution No. 168 passed at the meeting of the Council held on the 13th December 1921 and G.O. No. 42, Finance, dated 11th January 1922, the SECRETARY laid on the table a statement showing the appointments on Rs. 500 and above per mensem created by the Government from the 16th July 1922 to 30th November 1922.\*

## IV

## A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE REORGANIZATION OF THE MADRAS UNIVERSITY, 1922.

*Clause 2—cont.*

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The House will now resume consideration of the Madras University Reorganization Bill."

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAYAR :—"Mr. President, Sir, if you will kindly permit me, and if the House too will, I should like to move in a slightly amended form the amendment moved by the hon. Member, Professor Venkataratnam Nayudu."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Has the hon. Member given the required notice with regard to the amendment?"

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAYAR :—"I have not given the required notice."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Does any hon. Member object on the score of want of notice?"

\* Vide Appendix B on page 1480 infra.

[31st January 1923]

*Clause 2—cont.*

No objection was raised and Mr. ARPUDASWAMI UDAYAR continued :—

“The following is my amendment, Sir. (*‘University centre’* means a local area outside the limits of the University recognized by the Local Government on the recommendation of the Senate as containing colleges competent to do higher teaching and research work and to promote University life in a manner calculated to prepare for the institution of a new University.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“I am afraid the hon. Member, Mr. Arpudawami Udayar, is out of order. At present we are dealing with the definition of ‘University College’ and the hon. Member defines ‘University centre’. If he wants to put in a definition of that kind, he must bring forward a motion to that effect. He cannot amend the definition of a University College by defining something else. He is therefore out of order.”

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—“Sir, I rise to say a few words in support of the amendment suggesting the definition of ‘University College’. I am not able to follow the hon. Member for the University in his opposition to the amendment. It will be found that in the course of the discussion on this Bill when it was introduced it was fairly conceded and it was practically admitted by the hon. the Minister himself that the position of the mufassal colleges would be safeguarded and that they might hereafter develop into separate Universities. That was what he stated in his Statement of Objects and Reasons. When we find that in clause 27 of the Bill as amended by the Select Committee a specific reference has been made for the development of University centres, I fail to understand why there should be any objection to the formation of Universities which will no doubt form the nuclei to future Universities. It is not clause 27 alone to which attention has already been drawn that we need refer to. We may also refer to clause 51 of the Bill as amended by the Select Committee. It provides that the Senate shall at the end of five years from the passing of this Bill submit a report to the Local Government on the condition of affiliated colleges and on the desirability or otherwise of establishing other Universities outside the limits of the University. It provides for cases where there will be a full inquiry as to the stage of development of various affiliated colleges with the object that they may develop themselves into Universities later on. If that be the case, I cannot myself imagine why colleges which attain a stage of development which will enable them to form the nuclei of future Universities should not be admitted as University Colleges. The hon. the Advocate-General said that there was nothing practical suggested by the amendment. I do not think he is correct; for, a perusal of the amendment will show that it is a specific amendment brought forward by Mr. Venkataratnam Nayudu suggesting distinctly that the Academic Council should frame regulations for the purpose of recognizing University Colleges. There is a specific provision contained in the amendment and it is for the purpose of carrying it out that it is necessary for us to accept it.”

The Rev. W. MESTON :—“Sir, I am glad that two speeches of yesterday on this amendment made the situation very clear to us. One was the speech of Mr. Ramalinga Reddi, who made it obvious to us that what was being asked for was a matter of concentration upon colleges and not upon centres. The



31st January 1923]

[Rev. W. Meston]

• Clause 2—cont.

other speech was that of Dr. Macphail in which he made it clear that differentiation between colleges was being thought of, though it is not thought of in the Bill. Sir, if this particular proposal is put forward on behalf of the mufassal colleges, I must oppose it in the interests of those very colleges.

"I have so great a regard for the mover of this amendment that I very much regret having to oppose his proposition. At the same time, there is a fundamental difference in the point of view which he has brought out in his speech, a point at issue on which we must be perfectly certain. It is this. He has said to us perfectly plain in his speech that what he is trying to get at is the fostering of certain colleges by the university. Now, Sir, it has never been the policy of the University of Madras to foster any particular institution. It has fostered all colleges and sought to bring them into a position where they would most thoroughly discharge their functions as constituent members of the university. It is because there is an attempt now made through this proposal to lead us on to a new policy that I feel obliged to express the hope that the university will never have any idea of countenancing such a change.

"The matter of differentiation as between Madras and outside Madras has been adverted to. That differentiation is one simply of position or locality and it is not one of qualification. But, Sir, that which has been regarded as existing or being laid down by this Bill, the supposed differentiation of quantity that which has been regarded as an evil, it is nevertheless sought by this means to carry into the mufassal itself. So the differentiation, acknowledged to be a bad thing, is being brought into the mufassal colleges. I sincerely trust that no such thing as this will ever be thought of in connexion with a university. We are anxious to bring into existence not university colleges but university centres, and the machinery required for that purpose is laid down for us under clause 27 (f) of this Bill. I therefore urge that this amendment be withdrawn."

The amendment was by leave withdrawn.

The following amendment was not moved and was deemed to have been withdrawn :

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO—

18. (i) *Insert the following as sub-clause (c) :—*

'(c) "*University college*" means a college recognized by the university in accordance with the provisions of this Act, in which instruction is provided under prescribed conditions, and which is situated outside the limits of the university.'

(ii) *Re-letter the subsequent sub-clauses.*

MR. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"I beg to move that

19. *After the words 'students of the university' insert the words 'or students of any constituent or affiliated colleges'.*

"Sir, I have specially put this and similar amendments throughout the Bill with a view to better the position of the affiliated colleges. There are some advantages under the new Bill which, it is feared, will only benefit the colleges in the metropolis, and it is to enlarge the scope of these advantages that I have given notice of this and several

[Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar] [31st January 1923]

*Clause 2—cont.*

other similar amendments. One of the chief items of benefit under the new Bill has been laid stress on by the hon. Member in charge of the Bill when he said that the university should be made a teaching and residential university. And one of the chief conditions of a residential university is that there should be hostel-living for all the students. Whatever may be said of the other advantages of living in Madras there is absolutely no reason why hostel-living should not be extended to the mufassal colleges also. If there is any necessity for hostels in Madras, the necessity is all the greater in the mufassal centres where students come in large numbers from different places and where there will probably be none of the tutorial advantages which will be introduced in the metropolis. It may be said that the words 'students of the university' will in the ordinary circumstances include students of the affiliated colleges also. If that is the case, it is desirable that it should be made clear, for nowhere has the term 'students of the university' been defined, and in some of the provisions of the Bill where that term is met with, there seems to be a doubt as to whether it will include students of the affiliated colleges or not. There is no use of saying that the fears of the mufassal people are unfounded and things of that sort. Where it is a case of real fear, as in this particular case, the cause for the fear should be removed. In the definition of the word 'hostel', students of the university are mentioned, but it is feared that it may be only students of the metropolis. Therefore, it is necessary to make the position clear and say that the term 'students of the university' includes students of the affiliated colleges also, unless there is anything to the contrary. Or if the hon. the Minister thinks that the term 'university students' clearly includes students of the affiliated colleges also, I request that he may be pleased to put in a definition showing it. So I request the hon. the Minister to accept this amendment or agree to a definition of the words 'students of the university' as including students of the affiliated colleges also. Otherwise a very large number of benefits that can be had under this Bill cannot be enjoyed, and the feeling in the mufassal will become stronger that they have been neglected and may be more neglected in the future."

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR seconded the amendment.

Mr. R. G. GRIEVE :—" Sir, the hon. mover proposes to add the words 'or students of any constituent or affiliated colleges' to the term 'students of the university'. But the term 'students of the university' itself would necessarily include those in constituent colleges. If the wording is changed into 'including those in affiliated colleges', then the amendment would be all right. But in its present form it is not acceptable."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—" What I wanted was that the term 'students of the university' should include students of the mufassal colleges. In order to clear all doubt, it is better to define students of the university as including students of the affiliated colleges, or as including those of constituent or affiliated colleges. Either of these definitions will do."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I do not quite understand the position of the hon. Member, whether he is pressing his amendment, or going to withdraw it, or is contemplating any such thing." (Laughter).



31st January 1923]

Clause 2—cont.

MR. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ I threw out a suggestion that the Government might probably agree to a definition of the term ‘ students of the university ’ as including students of the affiliated colleges also. If the hon. the Minister gives an assurance that it will be done, I shall withdraw my amendment. I am awaiting his reply, Sir.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“ Sir, the Director of Public Instruction has already explained that the words ‘ students of the university ’ would include students of the affiliated colleges (University Bill) and I will make such amendments as may be necessary wherever convenient in the Bill.”

MR. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ Then I withdraw my amendment, Sir. The hon. Minister may introduce a definition wherever he thinks it desirable.”

The amendment was by leave withdrawn.

Sub-clause (e).

The following amendment was not moved, Mr. P. Siva Rao in whose name it stood not being in his place :—

19-A. *Omit this sub-clause and re-number the subsequent sub-clauses.*

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU then moved the following amendment which stood in his name :—

20. *Add at the end the following :—*

‘ and such other area or areas as may from time to time be prescribed by statutes ’.

In doing so, he said :—“ Mr. President, I beg to move the amendment of which I have given notice. At the same time, with your permission and the permission of the House, I should like to alter the wording slightly, so that the amendment after such alteration might read as follows :—

‘ *Or such other area or areas as may from time to time be prescribed by the Local Government on the recommendation of the university.* ’ ”

The permission to move the amendment in its altered form was granted by the House.

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU :—“ Sir, I must confess to a feeling of temerity in moving this amendment, after the strong opposition evoked by what I had believed to be a very simple and necessary amendment. It is also with mingled feelings that I move this amendment also because I am very much touched by, and feel thankful for, the extremely generous manner in which my hon. friend, the Rev. W. Meston, referred to me; and if on the one hand he and others generous like him feel it disagreeable to oppose anything that I move, I reciprocate that feeling as heartily and I feel equal reluctance in moving anything that may not be acceptable to them. But, at the same time, Sir, I am sure that that generosity implies also the position that each of us has to take his stand upon his own experience and judgment. I do not at all pretend to anything like the authority of either my hon. friend, the Rev. W. Meston, or my esteemed and hon. friend, Dr. Macphail, in matters connected with university education. But, Sir, with

[Mr. R. Venkataratnam Nayudu] [31st January 1923]

*Clause 2—cont.*

modesty I believe I might claim that for something like thirty-three years I, too, was connected with education and my life was passed far more in the sphere of mufassal colleges than in the field of metropolitan institutions. Therefore, it is natural that our view-points should differ. It is, I believe, a necessity that we should consider this question from somewhat different positions.

"Yesterday I had the kindness shown to me by the hon. House of permitting me to present a petition signed by about 85 or 90 residents in different parts of the Presidency, most of them educationists employed as principals or lecturers in about ten mufassal colleges. I do not wish in the least, because that would be preposterous, to over-awe this House with any recital of those names, but I shall at the same time venture to submit that when a certain opinion is held in common by so many individuals employed in the field of education, it merits very careful and very sympathetic consideration from this House. They are all at one, Sir, in stating that, handicapped as the mufassal colleges have undoubtedly been already, their position will be very seriously and prejudicially affected if this Bill, as it now stands, should be passed into law. They fear, and I venture to hold that that fear is neither alarmist nor sinister, that the mufassal colleges will so far suffer in prestige and capacity to command confidence that their intellectual and moral influence on the inhabitants of the districts will be considerably minimized.

"It is admitted on all hands, and, Sir, justly admitted, that unlike  
11-30 a.m. mufassal colleges in Bengal, mufassal colleges in Madras have a splendid record in their favour. Sir, if I may indulge in a little bit of rhetoric, I may say that there was a time when given a Porter and a Gopal Rao, Kumbakonam was the cynosure of neighbouring eyes, and again similarly, come a high-souled Metcalfe and the vigorous personality of a Virasalingam, the Rajahmundry College, while under very elementary circumstances, could be the fountain source of intellectual and moral fertilization that need not shrink comparison even with the great Godavari irrigation scheme. Therefore, Sir, there was a time when mufassal colleges could hold up their heads and claim that they had a distinct and distinguished position in the educational life of the Madras Presidency. But somehow other counsels prevailed and a new policy was persistently followed, consciously or unconsciously I cannot tell, so that at last we have come to this plight that, if we desire an object lesson in contrasts, we have only to look on the one side at the Presidency College and on the other side at the Rajahmundry College, both under one and same Government, the Presidency College a fondling and the Rajahmundry College a starveling. Therefore, Sir, there has been a widespread discontent as regards the treatment that was being given to these mufassal colleges.

"We are caught up at every stage with a subtle distinction made between university and Government. But we know, Sir, that in the actual fact the Government is behind the University and the university is only operative through the resources supplied by Government, and the Government and the university, intentionally or otherwise, turn their most favourable attention to the colleges in Madras. I am not, Sir, against Madras colleges. I should be one of the most ungrateful creatures in the world if I was not profoundly



31st January 1923] [Mr. R. Venkataratnam Nayudu]

Clause 2—cont.

thankful to at least one of the Madras colleges. But, Sir, I must be allowed to contemplate myself not as an old student of a Madras college but as an old student of Miller College, because, to my mind, Madras and Miller are not convertible terms. Granted a Miller, with his genius and with his noble and noteworthy band of co-adjutors, Miller College will be Miller College whether in Madras, or in the mufassal, or even in one of the distant isles of the Australasian archipelago ('hear hear' from Mr. L. A. Govindaraghava Ayyar), but that does not mean that Madras colleges have an intrinsic superiority in them. To define their real position I may use the Telugu expression, *Sthana balme gani thana balm gathu*, which means that it is the position of the locality and not personal potency. Anyhow, Sir, as my hon. friend, Professor Arpudaswami Udayar, pointed out in his speech when opposing the introduction of this Bill, all this has been due to an accident. But this Bill is going to make the accident an incident and a necessary characteristic feature of distinction between Madras and mufassal colleges.

"Sir, it was observed by my hon. and distinguished friend, Dr. Macphail, yesterday, and the observation has been repeated to-day by my hon. and esteemed friend, Mr. Meston, that this Bill nowhere makes a distinction between college and college. I venture to submit that this is an observation to be received with considerable qualifications. I believe the classification of mufassal colleges and Madras colleges into affiliated and constituent colleges is not a mere nominal distinction. There is a real, vital point of distinction between the two. Hon. Members, if they are pleased to glance at the second paragraph of the preamble, will observe what position is going to be assigned to the so-called constituent colleges, which are same as Madras colleges, under the new dispensation and what position is going to be assigned to, or rather what position are going to be consigned to, the mufassal colleges under the same regime. There is a great distinction; and I shall not provoke controversy by calling it an invidious distinction; but I cannot but consider it a radical distinction between one set of colleges and another. Sir, if we refer to clause 437 where there is a provision for funds in order to augment resources in the direction of laboratories, libraries, museums, workshops and professors, I beg leave to inquire which colleges are going to be chiefly, if not solely, benefited by these facilities. I was told yesterday that constituent colleges and affiliated colleges, in other words, Madras colleges and mufassal colleges, would draw grants each, according to its own requirements and its own merits, and that no distinction would be made between the two. Well, Sir, that reminds me of what I was once told of the treatment accorded by a certain master to his two servants, one of them complaining that the other servant received better emoluments, when the master avowed that the two had the same salary, and of course it was such a negligible factor that one of them had free rations and free quarters. Sir, these laboratories, these libraries, these museums, these workshops, these professors, they are sure to be mainly, if not solely, available for constituent colleges, and the constituent colleges will, therefore, to that extent be relieved of the charge and responsibility of providing those facilities. It is nowhere stated in the Bill that the university is going to confine its work to post-graduate and research studies, it desires also to work through the existing colleges even as regards the Pass degree courses. Therefore, all the advantages which are going

[Mr. R. Venkataratnam Nayudu] [31st January 1923]

*Clause 2—cont.*

to be provided in the City of Madras or what is termed 'within the limits of the university' all those improved methods and facilities will work to the benefit of the constituent colleges, and nevertheless, to say that no distinction is made between the two sets of colleges is something which I must confess my poor understanding is unable to grasp. Therefore, Sir, the apprehension, I beg leave to submit, is very real that there is going to be a very highly prejudicial effect exercised by this Bill upon the mufassal colleges, and these representations from the several heads of colleges and professors of colleges all point to one conclusion, namely, that if higher education, the university education of this Presidency, is to receive that encouragement, that evenly distributed aid and guidance from the Government and the university which we demand, which the country enjoins upon the Government and the university, methinks it is necessary that the benefits of the improved methods and facilities contemplated by the Bill should with necessary conditions and precautions be extended to at least some select centres in the mufassal.

"Sir, I desire that the House may be pleased to note the real import and significance of my amendment. It does not in the least militate against what is called 'the fundamental principle of the Bill', but what I should term 'the working basis adopted by the Bill'. That is not the 'fundamental principle of the Bill'. The 'fundamental principle of the Bill', as I understand it, is the improvement and the augmentation of the existing facilities for teaching and residential requirements. These exist to some extent, and it is proposed to increase them. It is in that direction that reform is sought to be brought about. But what I desire to point out is that this amendment of mine does not in the least take away that working basis. All that it says is this: let the working basis, as defined now, continue, and let it be used for the purposes for which it is meant; only, after all the precautions have been taken, after all the necessary inquiry and observation have been made, let it be open to Government, on the recommendation of the university, to extend the benefits of the new methods and improvements to certain select centres in the mufassal. I am desirous, Sir, to lay some detailed emphasis upon this point, so that my position may be clearly understood. All that I propose is this; if after the new organization has been established, after the new Senate, which will certainly be, as we all hope, more democratic and therefore better representative of mufassal interests than the present Senate, has been constituted, after the Academic Council and the Council of Affiliated Colleges have been formed, and after due care and consideration have been given with the necessary precautions and inquiry and past experience, it is found desirable, as it will certainly be highly beneficial, to extend the benefits of these new changes and improvements to some of the mufassal centres, let there be an opening. Let it not be necessary that the question should come before this Council and pass through all the elaborate process of a Bill. At the same time, Sir, I do not ask for an immediate announcement of such centres. All that I request is that there should be an opening for this purpose, so that the House may start this initial work on the basis of a limit as proposed in the Bill; only, let it be possible later on for other centres to come in.

"Sir, those that have read the Statement of Objects and Reasons of my hon. friend, the Minister for Education, who is in charge of this Bill, will have noticed that he has been pleased to state that a considerable amount of



31st January 1923] [Mr. R. Venkataratnam Nayudu]

• Clause 2—cont.

the activities of university professors will be extended to the mufassal colleges also and that there will be a reciprocity as regards the appointment and activities of university professors between mufassal and Madras colleges; and consequently, if after the experiment has been for a while tried, it is found that it is possible to extend the advantages of these new methods and improvements to some select centres in the mufassal, and that, too, on the recommendation of the Senate and again on the recognition of Government, why should there be any insuperable objection to that? These are the considerations, Sir, that have prompted me to table this amendment."

Diwan Bahadur Sir T. DESIKA ACHARIYAR :—"I second the amendment."

The Rev. Dr. E. M. MACPHAIL :—"Sir, I have not much to say on this amendment. I should like the House to understand that if  
11-45 a.m. carried it will strike at the basis of the Bill. While saying this, I should say that I reciprocate the good wishes of the mover, Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu. With due respect to him who, though he looks so venerable, is really my junior, I should like to point out that this Bill aims at setting up a university in a definite geographical position. That may be good or that may be bad, but that is the object with which this Bill is framed. Mr. Venkataratnam Nayudu's motion proceeds to bring in other geographical areas left undefined, and consequently it seems to me that it strikes at the root of the Bill. Therefore, if we accept this amendment we may as well scrap this Bill.

"In reply to the hon. mover I just want to say that during the 37 years that I have been connected with education, I have taken a great deal of interest in and have done my very best to improve the mufassal colleges. I think Mr. Venkataratnam Nayudu himself will recall what I have done to improve the condition of the mufassal colleges."

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU :—"I do remember it, Sir, with gratitude."

The Rev. Dr. E. M. MACPHAIL :—"I think, Sir, there is a certain delusion abroad with regard to the way in which Madras has been treating the mufassal colleges. We hear it occasionally in the Senate, and now Mr. Venkataratnam Nayudu has brought it up here. I should like to know definitely in what way Madras has had the advantage over the mufassal. It is certainly not with regard to grants. It is perfectly true that some colleges in Madras have large grants from Government, but they may make from private resources large contributions towards educational expenses. There is only one difference between the mufassal colleges and the Madras colleges, and that is, the latter are in the metropolis. It is extremely unfortunate for the mufassal that we had Dr. Miller here, and perhaps it is another grievance for the mufassal that Dr. Miller should have been here. Another grievance of the mufassal colleges seems to be that the University Library is not a circulating library, and that therefore it cannot be sent round to them. I do honestly feel and I have said so once and again in the Senate that sometimes our mufassal brethren have taken up rather an unkindly attitude towards us. As a matter of fact, the mufassal colleges are well treated by the Senate. There are a very large number of mufassal members in the Senate. I think

[Rev. Dr. E. M. Macphail]

[31st January 1923]

*Clause 2—cont.*

if it is examined, it will be found that there are more representatives of the mufassal institutions in the Senate than there are representatives of the Madras colleges.

"I really cannot understand what Mr. Venkataratnam Nayudu means by saying that there has been a change of attitude of the university towards the mufassal colleges during the last few years. He said that it is a step-motherly attitude. I do not believe that there has been any change but if people think otherwise, I should advise them that the best thing for them to do would be to cut themselves off as quickly as possible from the Madras University; and that is what is aimed at in this Bill. This Bill proposes to establish a separate university for Madras connected with the mufassal colleges at present by the tie of affiliation. But as soon as possible, it is proposed to separate them and then the step-motherly attitude must be abandoned.

"As regards the proposal of Mr. Venkataratnam Nayudu, it seems to me that he is simply intensifying what he considers as a grievance. If it is a grievance to treat Madras colleges differently from mufassal colleges, that grievance would only become greater when some mufassal colleges are treated differently from others. If, as the amendment proposes, some mufassal colleges are to be treated differently from others, then in fairness to those others the same treatment ought to be meted out to them also. For my part, I do not think that there has been any unfair treatment till now and I do not believe there will be any in the future. I shall certainly rejoice when the day comes when the different universities in the different parts of the Madras Presidency come into existence and when the Madras University will be allowed to go on its own way."

MR. P. SIVA RAO:—"Mr. President, I give my wholehearted support to the amendment that has been ably moved by my hon. friend, Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu. My reasons for supporting this amendment are very simple. This amendment is strictly in consonance and in harmony with the preamble of the Bill itself.

"The preamble says:

It is desirable by the concentration and co-ordination of resources for higher teaching and research at suitable centres outside the limits of the university to prepare for the institution of new universities.

Now, can it be contended for a moment that this amendment, if carried, will militate against the objects of this Bill? Now, Sir, it is also provided in clause 51 of the same Bill:

that the Senate shall at the end of five years from the passing of this Act submit a report to the Local Government on the condition of affiliated colleges and on the desirability or otherwise of establishing other universities outside the limits of the university. The Local Government shall lay the report before the Legislative Council and shall take such action on it as it deems fit.

So, Sir, the Senate has the unwholesome duty of reporting at the end of five years which is the best-fitted college to be termed a university centre and so forth . . . ."

The Rev. Dr. E. M. MACPHAIL:—"May I know, Sir, where the provision is for turning a college into a university?"



31st January 1923]

*Clause 2—cont.*

MR. P. SIVA RAO :—“ My answer is that there is provision in clause 51. It says that the local Government on the report of the Senate shall lay the same before the Legislative Council and take such action as it deems fit.”

Rev. Dr. E. M. MACPHAIL :—“ I am sorry ; the hon. Member said that there was provision for turning a college into a university. I ask him to point out where these words occur in the Bill.”

MR. P. SIVA RAO :—“ If there is any such provision my hon. friend, Mr. Venkataratnam Nayudu, would not have come forward with an amendment of this sort.”

Rev. Dr. E. M. MACPHAIL :—“ I understood the hon. Member to say that there was provision to that effect already in the Bill.”

MR. P. SIVA RAO :—“ I said, Sir, that there was provision in the Bill itself which would induce the Government to establish universities in convenient centres.

“ Now, Sir, I rise to a point of order. I ask if my friend, the Rev. E. M. Macphail, is in order in interrupting.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ The hon. Member should have raised his point of order a little while previously.”

MR. P. SIVA RAO :—“ The hon. Member, Dr. Macphail, said that the acceptance of this amendment would strike at the very root of this Bill. Now, Sir, I take exception to that. I was pointing out that there were provisions in the Bill itself which are preparatory steps for founding future universities. I pointed out to clause 51 which provides only for a report. Now, if this amendment is made, it will provide for a machinery in the Bill itself which without any further steps whatever on the part of the Government or on the part of the legislature will lead to the opening or founding of new universities. That, Sir, is my contention. Once it is conceded that it is the object of the Government and it is the object of the hon. the Minister to give every encouragement for the founding of future universities and that the Minister has himself made a clear provision to that effect, what is the harm in accepting an amendment like this? The amendment only says that in the case of a recommendation by the Senate the Government should found universities in such convenient centres as they deem fit. If the Bill is allowed to pass as it is, it only provides for a report by the Senate after a period of five years after the passing of this Bill. What is to become of the report if the Government cannot accept it? Afterwards the Government can issue an executive order that it is desirable to found a university centre at such and such a place, or can come out with another Bill.”

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU :—“ May I rise to offer a word of personal explanation, Sir? I am not contemplating the institution of new universities, by this amendment. But at the same time I am not saying that my friend, Mr. Siva Rao, has proceeded on a wrong path. It will be quite natural and in the fitness of things that such constituent colleges should go ahead. My immediate object is to recognize certain institutions in the mufassal as constituent colleges.”

[31st January 1923]

*Clause 2—cont.*

Mr. P. SIVA RAO :—"Sir, I gathered that that was the object of the amendment and I do not think I said anything contra to the original object of the mover which is to recognize certain colleges or centres which can conveniently form the nuclei for future universities. Again, the hon. Dr. Macphail said that the object of the Bill was to circumscribe the university and to make it a teaching and a residential one in certain geographical areas. If that is so, I think it will militate against the objects of the Bill as laid down in the Preamble which also makes provision for potential universities. It has been provided in the Bill itself that certain colleges have to be recognized even from now as potential universities and that they should be fostered and developed as such. With these few remarks I beg to support the amendment."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—"Mr. President, considering the regard that we have for the hon. Mover of this amendment, I am sure all of us would like to support him. My hon. Friend, Mr. Venkataratnam Nayudu, has really moved a radical amendment which goes to the root of one of the main principles, and, if it is accepted, let it be clearly understood that it is as good as rejecting the Bill. In this connexion I would like to point out to the hon. Members that having allowed the First Reading of the Bill to be carried without a division, now to put forward amendments and to raise debates vitally affecting each and every one of the main principles of the Bill seems to be somewhat anomalous. However, to show that this amendment if carried would practically amount to be destruction of the Bill, I would only point out that one of the objects of the Bill is to limit to a certain area the future reconstituted university in Madras so far as its teaching and residential aspects are concerned and if constituent colleges are to be recognized outside that limit it obviously amounts to cutting at the root of the main principle of the Bill. Without this essential limitation the reorganized university would be quite useless.

"It has been said by my hon. Friend that the University and the Government should be deemed to have effected radical changes by which the mufassal colleges have been reduced to a position of inferiority. My hon. friend also recalled to us the glorious days of Porter, Mateale and other educationists and implied that the University and the Government together have created a situation by which the Presidency College was placed in an advantageous position and the Rajahmundry and the Kumbakonam colleges were relegated to a comparatively inferior position. Well, on this point I am not here to defend the Government, but I may say one thing and that is that the university as its functions stand at present has absolutely nothing whatsoever to do either in the matter of initiating or governing the developments which tended to put the Presidency College in a more advantageous position than the mufassal colleges. Whether the Government was responsible for this state of affairs or not, it is not for me to say. But it appears to me that if scientific developments are to be undertaken, in the very nature of things it is not possible to undertake them in an equal measure in all the centres, and it therefore became unavoidable to select only a few centres and the Presidency College was naturally chosen for that purpose. Whatever may be the historical truth in that explanation, it is obvious that the university as



31st January 1923] [Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi]

*Clause 2—cont.*

such which only controls educationally the colleges in the mufassal and the metropolis has had nothing whatever to do with the policy of what may be called differential treatment to the colleges in the metropolis and in the mufassal. If such a policy has been deliberately adopted by the Government, what will be the result of this amendment? You will have certain colleges in Madras which will appropriate all the benefits and all the facilities created here by the professorial chairs, by the libraries, museums and workshops and it is because of their geographical position that these colleges are classed together as constituent colleges. If this amendment is carried, it will mean that the colleges in Rajahmundry or Tinnevely or in Mangalore which can by no means participate in these advantages should be given the same denomination as the metropolitan institutions. I think that this differentiation must be made, but we do not admit that it necessarily means that the mufassal colleges will be neglected. My hon. friend told us that he had already introduced an amendment with a somewhat similar object in view but after hearing the debate that took place on the amendment he withdrew that."

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU:—"I believe that the previous amendment was quite relevant; nor did I withdraw the same either out of deference to, or out of fear, at the turn which the debate had taken. I had some other object in view which perhaps you yourself, Sir, could divine. Therefore my hon. friend is not quite right in saying that I withdrew that amendment as a result of the debate which had taken place thereon."

MR. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"If my hon. friend had withdrawn that amendment on account of some ulterior object, well, I shall only be sorry to charge him with ulterior object."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The hon. Member did not say 'ulterior object'; he said 'other object'."

MR. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"I thought I was quoting textually. Anyhow, I think the object which this amendment has in view could be secured by accepting the motion of Mr. Arpudaswami Udayar."

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU:—"That was just my object, Sir."

MR. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"But that object will not be secured by the acceptance of this amendment. However I would suggest to you, Sir, I do not know if I would be in order in doing so—that if you can see your way to get Mr. Arpudaswami Udayar's amendment taken up for discussion we shall all be very glad to support it. We all appreciate the idea that the Government should prepare certain centres for future universities, but to say that the colleges in Tinnevely, Rajahmundry and other places could be classed similarly to the colleges in Madras is a proposition which we cannot accept. I would therefore suggest that we should get this amendment out of our way so that we may proceed with that of Mr. Arpudaswami Udayar."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Do I understand the hon. Member Mr. Venkataratnam Nayudu to say that he would prefer to have Mr. Arpudaswami Udayar's motion considered before voting takes place on this motion? I do not quite understand the position."

[31st January 1923]

## Clause 2—cont.

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU :—" I did not say any such thing. But whenever you, Sir, are pleased to make a remark, I receive it not merely as a remark but also as a suggestion (Laughter). Consequently, I do believe that it will be useful and desirable that voting on this amendment should be deferred till the fate or the fortune of the proposed amendment was settled, for by persisting in this, I may so rouse the animus of the House that both may share the same fate."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I think it will have to be formally moved by some hon. Member that the further consideration of this motion should be adjourned pending disposal of the other motion."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—" I beg to move, Sir, that the consideration of this amendment be adjourned pending disposal of item 22-A on the agenda."

The RAJA OF RAMNAD seconded the motion.

The motion was put and carried.

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAYAR :—" Sir, I beg to move—

22-A. *Add the following as sub-clause (n) :—*

'(n) *University centre* means a local area, outside the limits of the university, recognized by the Local Government on the recommendation of the university as containing one or more colleges competent to engage in higher teaching and research work and to promote university life in a manner calculated to prepare for the institution of a new university.'

" Sir, this amendment states explicitly what is impliedly contained, nay sometimes even explicitly stated in certain clauses of the Bill. I think the objection raised by the Advocate-General will no longer hold good, because there is the word 'centre' and not university college and we find mention made even in the Bill for the concentration and co-ordination of teaching resources outside the limits of the university at certain suitable centres. Secondly, it will also meet the objections raised by my hon. friend, Mr. Reddi, who pointed out that nothing should be done to set college against college or to give room for envy or jealousy by making invidious distinctions. Here is the question not of rivalry, but of trying to group colleges within a certain area to bring about that very co-operation which is necessary for creating an academic atmosphere or life and making provision for higher university teaching or research. I think it will also meet the objection raised by my hon. friend, Rev. Macphail, who rightly contended that the unitary type of teaching university should not be encouraged but that in the mufassal universities should be founded on the lines of the University of Madras. By grouping together different colleges and by allowing the different colleges to have their separate existence and to make a special contribution for the promotion of general culture, I think that danger also will be removed.

" That there are serious apprehensions entertained by many mufassal colleges appears very clearly from the petitions which were presented to the House by my hon. friends Messrs. Suryanarayana and Venkataratnam Nayudu and it is also clear from the circumstance that the very Sadler



31st January 1923] [Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udayar]

Clause 2—cont.

Commission while they recommended the institution of Teaching Universities in Calcutta and Dacca also pointed out the disadvantages to the mufassal and suggested as the only alternative remedy, the selection of centres which might be kept up as the focii of intellectual life and even independent thought. At present owing to lack of some kind of co-ordination or concentration of teaching resources, it is not possible for the various colleges existing in a given local area to come together and co-operate. I am really very thankful to what was stated yesterday by my hon. friend, Rev. Macphail, that there are colleges in the mufassal which are really as good as some constituent colleges in Madras. It does credit to his sense of justice and fair play.

12-15 p.m. “There are professors in those colleges who have made a special study and who are engaged in research work, but owing to lack of organization or provision for it, it is not possible for them to come together, nor is it possible for students to avail themselves of that special knowledge, which they possess and which has necessarily to remain locked up in the brains of professors, or dormant in laboratory rooms. There is no attempt whatever to differentiate or specialize; hence the need of retaining some provision for higher studies there, so that they may be kept up as so many nuclei of future universities. Hon. Members will agree with me that we are not to believe in sudden growths. We cannot have much faith in ready-made schemes. Under the present financial stringency it will take a very long time for us to find funds for the creation of different universities. Until that time let the torch of learning be kept burning in those centres where it has already been kindled. For the purpose of retaining those centres as nuclei of future universities I would exhort all the Members of this House to accept my amendment. The acceptance of this will go a great way towards allaying mufassal apprehensions and satisfying mufassal aspirations. With these few words I beg to move my amendment.”

MR. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—“I beg formally to second this amendment, and I feel sure that, if this is accepted, it will go a great way to remove the distinction—I was about to say invidious distinction—that will otherwise exist between the constituent colleges and affiliated colleges. I hope and trust that this amendment will be agreeable to the House.”

MR. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—“I beg to submit that instead of the words ‘to higher teaching’ the words ‘to engage in higher teaching’ should be substituted.”

The suggestion was accepted by the House.

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—“My hon. friend has concluded his speech by saying that in order to enable the mufassal colleges to be brought on a level with the colleges in the metropolis, the former should not be placed in a disadvantageous position. I do not agree with him when he says that the mufassal colleges will be placed in a more disadvantageous position than they are now. Nor do I say that they are doing less efficient work than the colleges in the city. However, in obedience to some of my hon. friends who are considered to be authorities on educational matters, I would satisfy them by accepting the amendment proposed by my hon. friend Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udayar.”

[31st January 1923]

*Clause 2—cont.*

The motion—modified as suggested by Mr. C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar—was put to the vote and carried.

Discussion was then resumed on Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu's motion.

MR. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ I support this amendment, and I am surprised that there should be any objection to this. It has been said over and over again that there is no distinction between the work done by mufassal colleges and colleges in the city. That is exactly the cause for our complaint. If there is distinction between college and college as to the good or bad work done by them, as to their merits or demerits, that will be a legitimate distinction. But now to say that a college is good, bad, or indifferent simply on account of its being located in a particular place seems to me to be quite unreasonable. At the time of the foundation of a certain college the founders might have thought it better to found that college in that particular place. Therefore to say that all the other colleges in that place, whether good, bad or indifferent, should all come under one category seems to me to be unreasonable. We hold that affiliated colleges are certainly not inferior to the constituent colleges, merely because of their geographical boundaries. Therefore, that there should be any difference made between the constituent colleges and affiliated colleges is our grievance. It has been said that the acceptance of this amendment will affect the basic principles of this Bill. This cry is usually the cry of the bureaucracy, and I submit that Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi has not yet absolved himself from the bureaucracy. When some time ago the people of this country asked for reforms in their constitution, the cry was raised that it would be dangerous if people were granted reforms before ten years. Coming to the subject under discussion, there is a specific reference made in the Bill that for five years the Government shall watch the progress made by the affiliated colleges and at the end of five years they shall submit a report on their working. We want a special provision to be included for all the mufassal colleges to be included in a particular category, if it is found that they are quite equal to the occasion within five or six years. I am afraid there is some confusion in the minds of some members that the amendments of Diwan Bahadur Venkataratnam Nayudu and Mr. Arpudaswami Udayar are the same. I respectfully submit the two are different. The latter is for the purpose of forming new universities and the former deals with the extension of the area of the Madras university. For instance, if in Chingleput or Conjeeveram several groups of colleges have been found working as efficiently as the constituent colleges, and if in the meanwhile the distance has been covered by railway or aeroplanes, there is no reason at all why this limit of ten miles should not be extended as to include a larger area. All this amendment asks for is that if at any time, say within five or ten years, the Senate finds, or the Government finds, that any particular area should be included in the university area which will have the benefit of constituent colleges, the Government should empower the university to include that area. I do not know if the hon. the Minister has no confidence in the university which has to recommend the new inclusion of mufassal colleges. Nor do I know if he has no confidence in his successors who will be in charge of this portfolio. What this amendment says is that the recommendation



31st January 1923] [Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar]

*Clause 2—cont.*

for recognition should first proceed from the Senate and then from the Government and it is only after that that recognition of a certain mufassal college should take place. I do not know if the Government have confidence in themselves, or in the Senate. When once the power is given in their hands, they may suspect everybody. Under these circumstances, I do not think that these amendments go to affect the basic principles of the Bill. There is absolutely no use of opposing every reasonable amendment saying that it is opposed to the basic principles of the Bill. If any amendment is against the basic principles approved at the time of the introduction, then it is open for them to raise a point of order. Instead of raising a point of order technically, they say that this amendment is opposed to the basic principle of the Bill, and that you may as well tear all the papers of the Bill, and so on. This, to my mind, is quite bureaucratic. There is no use of saying simply that this is foolish, that your reasons are unfounded and all that sort of things. We say that our reasons are well founded. It is not for the bureaucracy to say that the apprehensions of others are not well founded, or very reasonable. People occupying positions as professors and teachers in the mufassal and even the Rev. Dr. Macphail and others have said that the affairs of the mufassal colleges are quite as good as in the colleges of the city, and so the apprehensions entertained by the mufassal people are quite legitimate. Under the circumstances, it is not for the bureaucracy to say that the fears are imaginary and so on.

"Therefore, Sir, as we have said, this amendment is very necessary and very desirable, and it will only bring forth more inducement for colleges to spring up in places like Madura and Trichinopoly or in places where the cost may be a little cheaper than Madras and facilities for students may be more. Therefore, if the Senate is satisfied that a certain station is fit, and if the Government also accepts the recommendation of the Senate, there is no reason why the present Senate should not be entrusted with the power of recognition. I hope and trust that the hon. the Minister in charge will accept the amendment as it will not go against the basic principle of the Bill."

Mr. M. RATNASWAMI:—"If my friends Dr. Macphail and Rev. Meston felt some discomfort in opposing Mr. Venkataratnam Nayudu 12-30 p.m. I do not at all exaggerate when I say that I am filled with a certain amount of fear and trembling in opposing his amendment because when 25 years ago I was only a student of the High school classes he looked as venerable as he is now and I should have laughed at any man who prophesied that he and I would sit in the same Legislative Assembly.

"With this preliminary observation, Sir, I may say that there has been a good deal of looseness in the arguments put forward by my venerable friend in proposing the amendment. He seems to have lost sight of the fact that a piece of legislation like the one before the House can deal only with one university. We are here charged with the duty of establishing a new kind of university for the City of Madras, and in this one piece of legislation my friend, Mr. Venkataratnam Nayudu, wants the incorporation of some provision for the establishment of ways and means of founding similar universities outside the limits of this University. I am surprised that a member of the Reformed Legislative Council should give the

[Mr. M. Ratnaswami]

[31st January 1923]

*Clause 2—cont.*

right of creating universities to a Local Government. I should have thought such a thing quite legitimate in the bad old bureaucratic days; but that a member of the Reformed Council should go so far as to give this right of establishing universities to a Local Government—even a Local Government of which my friend, the hon. the Minister for Education, is a distinguished Member—is to my mind, Sir, absolutely against the principles of popular Government. It is a legislature and only a legislature that should be charged with the duty of creating universities, and I am sure that if in future conditions and circumstances should arise when such universities in other local areas should be recognized, and if people are satisfied that the time for the establishment of such universities has come, they will come to this hon. House and ask for provision for the establishment of such universities.

“Mr. Venkataratnam Nayudu chafes at the distinction between the mufassal and Madras colleges. Like most idealists he chafes at the two great obstacles of time and distance.”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“May I ask for a word of explanation, Sir, through you, from the hon. Member who is speaking? He said that the hon. Member who proposed this amendment has given away to Government the charter for the founding of new universities. I should like to know where he gets that from, from what he said, or from the amendment that is proposed, or from those that have been accepted hitherto?”

MR. M. RATNASWAMI :—“To proceed with my argument, Sir, my friend Mr. Venkataratnam Nayudu, like most idealists, wants to abolish the two factors of nature—time and distance. There is the idealist who wants to abolish time and wants to achieve progress in one mad frantic plunge; again, there is the idealist who wants to abolish distance; such idealists would like to abolish the distinction between Madras and the mufassal. Now, this is a fact of nature which we have to reckon with. For some reason the city of Madras was founded and made the capital city, and certainly for the life of me I am not able to understand why Madras was chosen as the capital of the Madras Presidency. It has no natural advantages to be chosen as the capital city. That was a thing which was done some two or three centuries ago and it is not for us to change it. It is a fact of nature which we have to reckon with.

“Mr. Venkataratnam Nayudu made much of the distinction that will be created under the Bill between the treatment given by Government to the Madras colleges and the mufassal colleges. May I point out to him—and I hope it will give him some consolation—that even between the Madras colleges there is some kind of differential treatment? There is my own college, the Pachaiyappa's College, which is not always getting that kind and generous treatment which other colleges get from the Government and the University of Madras.

“My chief objection to the amendment is that it wants to do a number of things at the same time. When we want the establishment of a new University in Madras, the hon. mover of this amendment wants similar



31st January 1923] [Mr. M. Ratnaswami]

*Clause 2—cont.*

universities established elsewhere also at one and the same time. I think it is an act of statesmanship to do one thing at a time and do it well. Here we are at the threshold of a new era for the University of Madras. Here we are charged with the duty of establishing one university and let us concern ourselves with this one single university now. After that, when we have founded this new university, let us later on when times and conditions arise proceed with the establishment of new and perhaps better universities than the new university in the city of Madras."

Mr. R. K. SHANMUKHAM CHETTIYAR:—"Mr. President, I venture to observe that, if this amendment is accepted, it will deny the very basic principles underlying this Bill. I can boldly say so because I at least cannot be charged, as my hon. friend Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar said, of carrying the bureaucratic tendencies. With all due respect to the revered mover of this amendment, it seems to me, Sir, that it implies a very serious misapprehension of the basic principle and the object of the legislation that is now brought forward. If the object of the 'Bill to provide for the reorganization of the Madras University' now before us is simply to improve the teaching qualities of certain colleges in the Presidency, I can understand the misapprehension caused in the minds of the representatives of the mufassal colleges. It might then be said that invidious distinctions are being made between one college and another simply because of the accident of their being situated at a particular locality to the detriment of other colleges which do not enjoy that natural advantage. But to my mind it seems, Sir, that the fundamental object of this Bill is not merely to improve the teaching qualities of any particular college or colleges, but to foster the development of academic life and corporate unity in the colleges in the Presidency. These words

to foster the development of academic life and corporate unity

that occur in the Preamble seem to me to convey the basic principle of this Bill and if that basic principle of this Bill is to be realized, I am sure it cannot be denied that it cannot be realized except by the means suggested by the revered Dr. Macphail, and that is by the creation of a localized university; and this Bill is intended for the purpose of creating such a localized university. My friend, Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar, said that in these days of aeroplanes, a limit need not be prescribed. May I say, Sir, that a university living on culture cannot be carried on by means of wireless telegraphs?—leave alone the aeroplanes. So that, if once we are decided on the fact that we want to foster the development of academic life and create corporate unity by the establishment of one university, then we are to settle whether that object can be realized by prescribing a certain geographical limit for the institution which we propose to establish, or by leaving it as it is at present.

"Another principle of this Bill which, to my mind, seems to be another basic principle is to prepare for the institution of new universities, and with due deference to the revered mover of this amendment, I must say, Sir, that the amendment, if accepted, will defeat this; for, if you are going to take away the geographical limit of your new university and if by accepting this amendment you are going to bring into the sphere of activity of the new

[Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chettiyar] [31st January 1923]

*Clause 2—cont.*

university that you are creating colleges situated hundreds of miles away from the centre of the university, then the creation of new universities in other localized centres will become as far remote as it is at present. It is from this point of view, Sir, I think that the acceptance of this amendment will defeat one of the most cherished objects of the Bill, and, therefore, with all respect to the hon. the mover, I beg to oppose the amendment."

Diwan Bahadur L. A. GOVINDARAGHAVA AYYAR:—"Sir, it seems to me that the amendment which has been moved by Mr. Venkataratnam Nayudu is a complement to the amendment that has been accepted by this House. The Bill speaks of a University Centre in places where you find colleges which are capable of rising in the fulness of time to the position of University institutions themselves. What this amendment says is that outside this ten-mile area also we shall have constituent colleges which are capable of becoming members of the university and which in their turn may become the units forming the foundations of separate universities. The purposes of the amendment that has been just carried and of the amendment that my hon. friend has proposed are exactly the same, and, unless this amendment also is carried, the good that is sought to be effected by the other amendment is not likely to be complete.

"Now, Sir, certain objections have been advanced and a great deal of controversy, if I may respectfully say so, of an irrelevant character, has been introduced into this. What exactly the conduct of the university or of the Government has been towards the Madras colleges and the mufassal colleges is not a matter of any great consideration so far as this amendment is concerned. The question is first, whether there are any colleges in the mufassal which are entitled, consistently with the principles of this Bill, to such treatment as this Bill gives to the colleges in Madras; and secondly, if there are such colleges, is there anything in the basic principles of this Bill which will militate against proper consideration being shown to these colleges? These, I submit, Sir, are the two fundamental questions in view of which the amendment now before the House has to be considered.

"Now, Sir, it seems to me that, looking at this amendment from these standpoints, absolutely nothing has been said as to why this amendment should not be accepted. I am quite aware that it has been pointed out that the geographical position is a very important matter in this. More than one speaker opposed this amendment, and I must grant that the authority of some of them is indeed very great. It is perhaps presumptuous on my part to pit myself against them, but it is the confidence that I have that there is nothing in that objection that has enabled me to place myself against that view.

"Now, Sir, it has been stated that the geographical position is everything in this. With due respect, I venture to differ. I quite recognize that aeroplanes cannot very well help us so far as the constitution of constituent colleges with respect to the mufassal colleges goes, but I do believe that the purpose of this Bill can be left unimpaired even if you select constituent colleges from among those over which this residential and teaching University of Madras will have control. Now, Sir, it is not the geographical



31st January 1923] [Mr. I. A. Govindaraghava Ayyar]

*Clause 2—cont.*

position that matters. It is the advantage which this geographical position is supposed to give that does matter. And it is because those who are in favour of the amendment are anxious that these advantages should be shared by some of the colleges outside the ten-mile area which are perfectly capable of sharing those advantages and perfectly capable of discharging the responsibilities that may be imposed upon them, it is because I say there are such colleges that this amendment is called for. There was one objection which to me appeared the soundest one that could be taken to this amendment and that was what was given by my friend, Mr. Shanmukham Chettiyar. He pointed out that one of the basic principles of this Bill is to foster academic life and corporate unity and with considerable reason he said that if you disperse the areas over which these constituent colleges are to function, it might be that you would not gain that object. I do recognize the force of that objection. But after all the question is where is the balance of the two evils, or the balance of the two advantages. I may just point out to Mr. Shanmukham Chettiyar that that clause on which he laid stress very properly is somewhat modified by what follows it. It says:

By so promoting co-operation among the colleges and between the university and the colleges as to utilize to the full the teaching resources available within the limits of the university.

“ This corporate unity which is developed out of academic life is supposed to be achieved by the utilization of the teaching resources that the university may command. Now it will be possible for the teaching resources to extend their functions and activities over these colleges in the mufassal. There are other provisions in the Bill which do contemplate a possibility of that kind. The limitation of the area, if I may venture to say so, will be a great evil to such provisions. Therefore, it seems to me, that that objection by itself ought not to stand in the way of this amendment.

“ Putting aside that objection, let us see what remains. It is undoubted, camouflaged it, if you will by words, that it is impossible to assume that once this Bill is passed into law that the constituent colleges will stand, so far as the advantages go, exactly in the same footing as the mufassal colleges even if the mufassal colleges are such university centres as we desire to have according to this amendment. Nor can it be denied that, so far as the present equipment, efficiency, capacity or usefulness is concerned, there are certain mufassal colleges which are in no way inferior to the colleges in Madras. The object of the amendment, I take it, Sir, is that there ought to be no differentiation made, that there ought to be no inequality allowed so far as the capacity of these colleges is concerned by this Bill which will perpetuate the distinction that there is already, which will intensify that distinction and which will make these colleges less useful. Now for that purpose it is that it is stated that when once the university recognizes that a particular college outside this ten-mile area is one whose standard of teaching, whose capacity for the preservation of discipline, whose methods of promoting higher research, and whose capacity for higher teaching are all equal to the standard in Madras, when once the university is so satisfied, when the local Government is bringing to bear the recommendations of the university under the scrutiny of such experts as the local Government can

[Mr. L. A. Govindaraghava Ayyar] [31st January 1923]

*Clause 2—cont.*

command and when the local Government agrees with that suggestion, can it be stated that those colleges cannot also be recognized as constituent colleges coming under the purview of this Bill? That is a very modest proposition, Sir, and I hope that the considerable amount of heart-burning that now undoubtedly exists—if I may say so, with perfectly good reasons—in the mufassal colleges, can be removed by the acceptance of this amendment. After all one has to recognize even if logic in all its completeness is against us that it is something if you are really able to placate real and sincere opposition, the real and sincere feeling that the mufassal colleges are going to be starved for the purpose of the aggrandizement of the Madras colleges, and that it is something if that heart-burning is removed by your having the definition of the constituent colleges as to include colleges which may serve to satisfy the standard that may be in point of efficiency equal to the Madras colleges but which unfortunately are not situated within the ten-mile radius that is contemplated by this Bill. Now, Sir, it was said by Dr. Macphail that the best way for the affiliated colleges was to cut themselves adrift if they thought that they had been accorded a step-motherly treatment. I am sorry that such expressions have come from Dr. Macphail."

Rev. Dr. E. M. MACPHAIL :—" I do not know if I said that ; at any rate, I did not mean to say that. I did not say that they should cut themselves adrift. What I said was, ' if they were badly treated they should not mind that they were separated from the university.' "

Diwan Bahadur L. A. GOVINDARAGHAVA AYYAR :—" I took a note of what the hon. Member said. But since he did not mean that I do not want to pursue the matter."

Rev. Dr. E. M. MACPHAIL :—" I should be sorry to go back. I stand by what I said."

Diwan Bahadur L. A. GOVINDARAGHAVA AYYAR :—" The impression, Sir, that has been produced on my mind—and nothing that I have heard from Dr. Macphail has gone to change it—is this : that if the colleges feel that they have not been properly treated they would be well advised to cut themselves adrift. It is all very well to say that, when one is in a position of advantage and when the person to whom this advice is tendered cannot for any fault of his own be able to command the same advantage. But what has been all along complained of—and this Bill goes to accentuate it—is that the colleges in Madras by the sole accident of being near the throne of grace have utilized such opportunities as they might possess for purposes of aggrandizement."

Rev. Dr. E. M. MACPHAIL :—" I wish to know if this is relevant to the discussion."

Diwan Bahadur L. A. GOVINDARAGHAVA AYYAR :—" Relevancy and irrelevancy are matters of opinion and I am not going to join issue with my hon. friend about them. If what he has stated is irrelevant, mine may also be irrelevant. But apart from that, what I want to mention is this. There is a feeling which is, I think, somewhat well-grounded, but into the reasonableness of which it is unnecessary for us to enter, that the Madras colleges are treated better than the rest. As I said, if it should be possible for us by



31st January 1923] [Mr. L. A. Govindaraghava Ayyar]

*Clause 2—cont.*

anything that we can do consistently with the acceptance of the principles that this Bill is intended to give effect to, to remove that impression if that is possible for us I think. Sir, that this House would be well advised in doing it. I think that the recognition of constituent colleges outside the ten-mile area will go a great deal to allay that fear. Justice is on their side; reason is on their side and if policy too is on their side I do not see why this amendment should not be accepted."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"Expressing my general agreement with all that my hon. friend, Mr. Govindaraghava Ayyar, has said on this matter, I should like to make one or two observations. In the first place, the whole problem about this Bill is the question of the method and the manner of the new university teaching and that was the question which was placed before the members at the time of the introduction of the Bill. Whatever you may say we are again coming to the question of the discussion of the method and manner of carrying out the principal object of the Bill. I said that the principal object of this Bill is first of all to establish what my friend, Mr. Patro, called residential and teaching university and which my hon. friend, Dr. Macphail, calls the local university, an entirely different thing."

Rev. Dr. E. M. MACPHAIL:—"In Madras?"

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"Yes, in Madras; but it is quite a different thing. The local university is entirely a different thing from a teaching university in Madras. I am perfectly certain that there is a difference."

Rev. Dr. E. M. MACPHAIL:—"It may or may not be a residential and teaching university. The point is that it is a local university. My objection is that it is not making a local university in Madras."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"My friend uses a different set of words, and when I ask him whether he wishes to convey a different meaning or idea he says, 'It may be or it may not be so'. But I am certain that what my hon. friend means by a local university is entirely different."

Rev. Dr. E. M. MACPHAIL:—"A word of explanation, Sir. A teaching university, as I said in my speech when the Bill was introduced, may mean two different things. This is going to be a different kind of teaching university from the one we have now. It is going to be a teaching local university. In my speech on that occasion I expressed my regret that Mr. Patro had put in the word 'residential' because, I think it is misleading. I believe that all that is intended by the expression is that the university is going to exercise more control over the residence of students and not that is going to compel all to live in colleges. But I said that there was going to be a local university in Madras."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"Well, there is a difference between Mr. Patro and Dr. Macphail and I do not wish to go into it. But what I say is this. The whole question of the method of university life was before the hon. the Minister and Dr. Macphail . . ."

[31st January 1923]

*Clause 2—cont.*

Rev. Dr. E. M. MACPHAIL :—" May I again explain with regard to that? What I said was that if the University of Madras had treated the mufassal colleges badly, which I do not admit, they had the liberty of cutting themselves adrift."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" We did welcome that liberty. We pressed for the formation of what may be called a local university for another local area, and if those proposals and if similar proposals of that character had been put through, my hon. friend would not have taken this trouble at all. These proposals not having been taken we have to make the best of the situation to see that the objects of the Bill, which are for the establishment of a local university in Madras and would-be centres of future universities, are strictly carried out throughout the provisions of this Bill. Therefore, the first proposal which has been accepted—I mean the proposal which has been accepted in the amendment of my hon. friend Mr. Arpudaswami Udayar—carries out the idea of at once recognizing, on the recommendation of the Senate, certain centres as university centres which will form future universities. Those are to be not single towns but the areas may be ten miles, may be a district or may be two districts. That does not matter. There may be universities, say, at Trichinopoly with three colleges, another at Coimbatore for the district of Coimbatore—there are already the Agricultural College and the Forest College and probably a first-grade college may be coming in the near future; there may be a university for the two or three districts in the Circars, and there may be a university of the unitary type for the Central districts for which I do not see any possibility at present. So that we want first of all this idea of the recognition, once for all, of these local areas as centres of future universities. Having done this we have still another grievance and that is that during the period of transition the difference which this Bill makes between the constituent colleges and the affiliated colleges is likely to embarrass considerably not only the local university in Madras but also many of the mufassal colleges. On that matter we need have no suspicion whatever. As soon as we consider the colleges in Madras as constituent colleges of the university there is absolutely no doubt that people will try to come here. The amendment states that during the period of this transition, local areas outside, like Trichinopoly or some centre in the North, should equally be considered centres of future universities. I do not know why my friend should consider this as going against the very basic principle of the Bill.

" I shall now answer Mr. Ramalinga Reddi's point. He was in charge of Education in Mysore. There is a college at Mysore and another at Bangalore at a distance of 90 miles. Did it prevent him from treating college at Bangalore as a constituent college?"

MR. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—" The two colleges specialised in different the lines and did not overlap."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" There is no object in differentiating by saying that one was specialising in science and the other was not. One was 90 miles away from the other. Did that prevent him?"



31st January 1923] [Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu]

Clause 2—cont.

1 p.m. "In this amendment we suggest that the colleges at Trichinopoly or some other centre may be regarded as constituent colleges, and that under the guidance of the Senate and the Academic Council these colleges may be asked to take such steps as will bring out co-ordination and concentration of studies as laid down in the provisions of this Bill. Therefore, I am really unable to appreciate the fears that have been expressed by my hon. friends that this particular amendment would destroy the very object of the Bill.

"Again, Sir, Mr. Ratnaswami said that my hon. friend, the mover, was giving away the case for the Senate of the University by giving power to the Government to issue charters to new universities. I am afraid that though I had tried to get something out of him by way of explanation, he did not vouchsafe it, and I believe that, on account of his silence, presumption should be drawn against him."

Mr. M. RATNASWAMI:—"I did not give any answer for the simple reason that I never heard the question."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"Then the obvious remedy was in his own hands. He might have asked me through you, Sir, to repeat the question. Now that he has heard me, I should like to know whether he has any explanation to offer with regard to what he said."

Mr. M. RATNASWAMI:—"I want him to repeat his question."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"I understood my hon. friend Mr. Ratnaswami to say—that is what I gathered from his speech, for sometimes I do not hear him also properly—that he was rather surprised to see that my hon. friend, Diwan Bahadur Venkataratnam Nayudu, gave away to the Government the power of issuing charters to new universities.

"So far as I understand, the hon. gentleman who proposed the amendment or those who supported it never said a word about giving power to the Government for the formation of new universities."

Mr. M. RATNASWAMI:—"According to the amendment, there are these words: 'such other area or areas as may from time to time be prescribed by the Local Government on the recommendation of the university.' My point was that the hon. mover of the amendment was giving the right of establishing universities to the Executive Government, whereas the power should lie with the legislature."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"That is only for a declaration that it should be a university centre. Anyhow, I do not wish to pursue the matter further."

"There is only one other matter to which I wish to refer, viz., the question about the advantages of the mufassal colleges as against the advantages which the colleges in Madras enjoy. Whatever my hon. friend, the Rev. Dr. Macphail may say, there is absolutely no doubt that colleges in the mufassal certainly feel that their claims are not as much recognized as those of the Madras colleges. It is also clear from what Mr. Ratnaswami

[Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu] [31st January 1923]

Clause 2—cont.

has said that there is also difference between colleges and colleges in Madras in the matter of treatment. The differentiation between the mufassal colleges and the Madras colleges is as real and as well-founded as that between colleges in Madras, to which Mr. Ratnaswami has given expression. Certainly both the hon. gentlemen are distinguished educationalists, and it is not for me to say who is right and who is not."

Mr. R. G. GRIEVE :—"May I know what the differentiation is?"

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"I did not make the statement. So, I think that my hon. friend ought not to put that question to me. He should have put it to Mr. Ratnaswami, and I am perfectly sure that Mr. Ratnaswami would have answered it. I do not wish to go into that matter further. But I may assure my hon. friends who do not agree with us that in making our criticisms on this Bill we are doing our level best to improve it to the satisfaction of all parties concerned. It is not a question of Madras or mufassal. We really want at the very outset on the introduction of a new Bill on university reorganization to see that that Bill is put on right lines and that it satisfies all persons concerned.

"I may refer my friend Dr. Macphail, to the following paragraph in the petition which has been presented yesterday to this Council on behalf of certain gentlemen who are as distinguished as those who have taken the opposite view to-day."

Rev. Dr. E. M. MACPHAIL :—"I am not furnished with a copy of that petition, Sir."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"That is not a matter for me. He can get a copy from the Secretary. They say :

We feel that a crisis is impending for the progress of university education in the Presidency ; and unless it is averted at this juncture by wise and far-seeing legislation, the consequences will be too serious and widespread to be counteracted later on. We, therefore, beg to suggest that the Bill be so modified as to safeguard the interests of the mufassal colleges, by placing such of them as can maintain certain standards of efficiency on a footing of equality with the colleges in Madras, i.e., by recognizing them as Constituent Colleges of the University to participate fully in its academic life and activities, while the system of affiliation will take in those colleges, in and outside Madras city, which fail to come up to the required standard."

In other words, the distinction between 'constituent' and 'affiliated' colleges should be based on an essentially educational test—that is, upon the efficiency and equipment of the institutions, and not chiefly upon the accident of geographical position. It would be the very height of injustice to exclude a college like St. Joseph's College, Trichinopoly, with its great traditions and hundreds of students, from a full participation in the advantages of the new scheme. This plea for fair treatment applies to the case of certain other colleges as, for instance, the Maharaja's College, Trivandrum, the Maharaja's College, Vizianagram, and the Government Colleges at Kumbakonam and Rajahmundry.

"Finally, Dr. Macphail says that the main characteristic of the Bill is that there is no educational standard laid down either for a constituent college or for an affiliated college. I shall only read the definition of the 'constituent college' to show that it is intended to lay down such an educational standard. Clause 2 (b) says :

'Constituent College' means a college maintained or recognized by the university in accordance with the provisions of this Act in which instruction is provided under prescribed conditions and which is situated within the limits of the university.



31st January 1923] [Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu]

Clause 2—cont.

“So far as I can see, the original draft of this Bill, which was published for criticism, laid down certain educational standards not only for constituent colleges but also for affiliated colleges. The question with reference to affiliated colleges was discussed, and, as my hon. friend would see, that portion which referred to affiliated colleges was omitted. Still the definition of constituent colleges does connote that under the statutes certain qualifications and standards, as are suggested by the Saddler Commission, are proposed to be laid down. Whatever that may be, the recognition of a certain number of colleges within an area of ten miles round Trichinopoly or round Rajahmundry as constituent colleges during the period of transition will not in the slightest degree retard the development of Madras either as a local university or as a residential university; but during that period of transition there will be an equality of treatment, equality of educational opportunities, until those institutions are cut away into separate universities, as suggested in the other amendment of my hon. friend, Mr. Arpudaswami Udayar.”

Mr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“Mr. President, Sir, my hon. friend, Rev. Dr. Macphail, has made it very clear that the acceptance of this amendment will lead to the throwing out of the principle of the Bill, which is the establishment of a teaching university in Madras, and he very well emphasized that point in answer to the question of Mr. Ramachandra Rao. Some of our friends want that there should be constituent colleges as far north as Vizianagram. That will touch the very root of the Bill, and I think that my friend, Mr. Shanmukham Chettiyar, has also made that point clear. My hon. friend, Mr. Ramachandra Rao, gave the example of the Mysore University and said that there was a college 90 miles away from the centre of the University. My hon. friend, Mr. Ramalinga Reddi, has explained that the college at Bangalore has specialized in Science and the college at Mysore concerns itself with other subjects like History and English. When the University was established there, they did not want to bring the Science classes to Mysore, nor did they want to transfer the History classes to Bangalore. As a matter of economy they had two colleges at different centres, one teaching Science and the other Arts. Such a consideration does not arise here, because there are colleges in Madras which are teaching all the subjects necessary for a university. I thought the acceptance of the amendment of Mr. Arpudaswami Udayar met the object in view of my hon. friends opposite, and that my friend, Mr. Venkataratnam Nayudu, would withdraw his amendment after its acceptance. But for reasons best known to himself, he chooses to press his amendment. If the House accept this amendment, it will amount to altering the principles of the Bill. I therefore earnestly appeal to the House to throw out the amendment now before the House.”

The RAJA OF RAMNAD :—“Like the previous speaker I too thought that if the hon. mover had accepted the postponement of his amendment it was in order that the amendment of Mr. Arpudaswami Udayar might go forward. But, now, since he is pressing his amendment to a division, I wish to say a few words regarding it. I do not know why people are so much enamoured of things obtaining in

1-15 p.m.

[The Raja of Ramnad]

[31st January 1923]

Clause 2—cont.

Madras. There are certain conditions which are peculiar to Madras; the Original Side of the High Court, the Madras Corporation Act, the Presidency Magistrates, these are things which you cannot ask to be extended to the mufassal. (Laughter.) As to the basic principle of the Bill, I do not think I need repeat the eloquent arguments of my friend, Mr. Shanmukham Chettiyar. But if this permissive provision goes into the Bill, I am afraid it will considerably damp local enthusiasm for starting universities in selected centres. They will always concentrate their energy in agitating to get their colleges attached to the Madras University. I am one of those who think that more universities ought to be formed in this country at suitable centres, and this provision is prejudicial to it. I am afraid I cannot support the amendment, but I have such great respect to the hon. the mover that I should be unwilling to vote against his amendment if I could help it."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo:—"Mr. President, I have very little to say on the subject after the long discussion and the lucid exposition by speakers more competent than myself. It seems that some of the hon. Members are under the impression that we shall be starting a new thing if we extend the limits of the University beyond ten miles of Madras."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"If you extend it to another mile, no question of principle will arise."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo:—"So far as my knowledge goes, the Patna University has already accepted this principle. The college at Cuttack, which is, I think, 500 miles off Patna, is a constituent college of the Patna University. I do not see any reason, Sir, why colleges as famous and as well equipped as those in this Presidency, for instance the colleges at Rajahmundry, Madura and Trichinopoly, should not be taken as constituent colleges."

"The second point which I want to impress upon the House is that even if we confine ourselves to this ten-mile limit, I am afraid there will be no provision for agricultural instruction in the Madras University, because our Agricultural College is located at Coimbatore. So, I think we shall have to compromise with the principle. I therefore request the hon. Members of this House to consider the matter with the attention that it deserves and accept the amendment of the hon. Member, Mr. Venkataratnam Nayudu."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"Mr. President, at this late hour I do not wish to take up the time of the House."

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU:—"He has addressed the House."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"An appeal went forth to him from Mr. Ramachandra Rao, and he may reply to it."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"Mr. President, I do not think I need enter into any details as regards the constitution of the Mysore University. We had difficulties there and I would not say that everything there is a counsel of perfection."

"It has been said that unless some of the mufassal colleges are recognized as constituent colleges, the apprehensions of the mufassal people will not be



31st January 1923] [Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi]

*Clause 2—cont.*

allayed. Of course, we must take into consideration all those apprehensions and seek a remedy for them. I, however, think that this particular remedy is not, in the slightest degree, going to meet the difficulty. On the contrary it is just possible that if this amendment is accepted it will place the mufassal colleges in a far worse light and condition, because at present there is a distinction between colleges in Madras and colleges outside—a distinction based purely on geographical grounds. If this amendment is accepted it will create a differentiation, based on a new principle that has not hitherto existed, between the affiliated colleges themselves as colleges of superior grade fit to be called constituent colleges and inferior affiliated colleges. I consider this to be entirely undesirable.

"Now, it has been said that there is an inequality. If there has been an inequality already, it has not been produced by any legislative enactment, and the fact that there is an inequality not due to legislative enactment is no reason why we should by an Act classify the mufassal colleges into higher and lower grades. There is no question of inferiority as regards the mufassal colleges. Anantapur is building up a big college, the equal of any in the branches it takes up. The College at Tinnevely may receive large grants, it may be a first class institution, yet it cannot share in the daily life of the University as colleges do in Madras. For that reason, and that reason only, we want to differentiate constituent colleges from the rest."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"May I know, Sir, if my hon. friend is entitled to cover any new ground to which no reference was made. This has nothing to do with my remarks."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—"I appeal to you, Mr. President, to order whether I have covered any new ground or am only traversing the full-dress debate that has been initiated on this amendment. I myself deprecate full-dress debates on either side in the Committee stage; but since that has been opened, I thought it best to allay the apprehensions of the mufassal Members on this point. I do not wish to say more on this subject."

"We cannot make any progress if at every stage we have to go back to the original principles and create difficulties. I therefore feel strongly, especially out of consideration to the feelings of the mufassal people, that the amendment of Mr. Arpudaswami Udayar be accepted as it provides for all the conditions necessary to safeguard the interests of the mufassal colleges and also as it provides a motive for developing in those localities new universities. I hope this amendment will not be accepted by this House, since it merely creates a confusion of ideas by mixing up the centres of future universities with the territorial expansion of the local University."

The Council adjourned for lunch at 1-25 p.m.

The Council re-assembled after lunch at 2-30 with the hon. the Deputy President in the chair.

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU :—"Sir, in rising to reply to the objections raised against my amendment, I shall be very brief in my remarks and that for three reasons. One is that several of the points which I would urge in favour of this amendment were to a large extent submitted by me as I moved the amendment. And several of them have in the

[Mr. R. Venkataratnam Nayudu] [31st January 1923]

*Clause 2—cont.*

course of the discussion been also repeated and re-emphasized much more effectively in several cases than I could aspire to by supporters of the amendment. As a teacher once said to his pupil when he asked for a second explanation, if I have not explained the matter to your understanding the first time I am afraid I cannot do it the second time. That is one reason why my answer will be very brief. The second is that, if objections have been raised against this amendment, as they have been from different speakers, I believe that several of them have been also met, to what effect I cannot tell, by some of the supporters of the amendment. The third and the paramount consideration is, I believe I know what is going to be the fate of this amendment and therefore, I feel, as an old man, I might spare myself.

“Now, Sir, so far as I can make out, there are these chief objections. One is that the amendment will necessitate the shelving of the whole Bill by the fundamental principle of the Bill being deleted. I took some care and made some effort to meet that point when moving the amendment. Let it never be supposed, for that is not at all my intention, that I ask for the surrender of what is called the principle, or of what I would prefer calling the working basis, namely, limiting at the first instance the operation of the proposed teaching University to the area mentioned in the Bill. I only suggest that if subsequent investigation and experience should justify the expansion of that area to certain particular localities, or even to a single locality on account of favourable conditions obtaining there, then let the benefit of participating in the improved methods and newly supplied advantage of the reorganized system be extended to them also. As one of the hon. Members who supported this amendment pointed out, the amendment is hedged in by so many conditions and circumstances that there is not the remotest chance of anything being done in a haphazard fashion against the real object of the Bill. There will be an examination, an enquiry, a scrutiny made through competent bodies like the Council of Affiliated Colleges and the Academic Council. Then their representation, if there be one, will be further considered by the University or the Senate. The recommendation of the Senate will then have to come before Government, and it is only the recognition the Government that will accord to any new area this privilege of being treated as a constituent or integral part of the teaching University. Sir, it has been said that we cannot have a circulating library or an itinerant University for the whole of the Presidency. But surely, Sir, it appears to me that we can have not a circulating library, but two libraries, and thus we are sure to utilize the local resources and supplement them through the University. As regards the teaching agency, as I submitted this morning, the Statement of Objects and Reasons itself concedes the practicability, and even the desire, of extending to mufassal colleges the advantages of instruction by, and through the agency of, professors of the University. It also says that certain members of the staff of mufassal colleges, if found competent, will be appointed University professors. Thus there will be reciprocity in the matter of University professors and consequent reciprocity in the matter of University teaching; and that is an essential factor.

“My hon. friend, Mr. Shanmukham Chettiyar, drew attention to the fact that academic life and corporate unity would not be possible if the limits of



31st January 1923] [Mr. R. Venkataratnam Nayudu]

*Clause 2—cont.*

the university were extended considerably beyond a proposed limit. In that connexion I feel—and I should be glad to be set right—I am unable to see how if all the pre-requisites are provided as regards teaching, as regards residential accommodation, tutorial guidance, discipline, equipment, recreations and other facilities in any particular locality, I say I am unable to realize that to any extent it is impossible to reproduce academic life and corporate unity there. To take the case of Trichinopoly : leaving alone those who are in the intermediate classes and confining our attention to such as are in the B.A. classes for the pass or the honours, there are so many as 850 students. Now, will that not be enough material for what we call academic life and corporate unity? Again, as my hon. friend, Diwan Bahadur Govindaraghava Ayyar, pointed out, this corporate unity and this academic life are sought to be given through co-operation between the colleges and the university. And this co-operation between the colleges and the university by husbanding their resources, by utilizing their teaching facilities, can, in my humble opinion, be maintained between the university and certain select mufassal colleges. Really, Sir, the fundamental point of it is this. Shall we be content with classifying colleges into two divisions on the basis of geographical position, or shall we also recognize the very reasonable consideration that the classification should be based on the function, based upon the educational capacity, based upon standards? Sir, as my hon. friend, Professor Arpudaswami Udayar said, in the speech with which he opened the opposition to the Bill when the Bill was introduced, that it seeks to establish two classes of university life with different kinds of teaching, equipment, standards and therefore results. It is to minimize this difference as far as possible in favour of the mufassal colleges that I have undertaken to move this amendment. How it takes away the basic principle of the Bill I cannot really understand. The basic principle is not to establish for the first time, but to extend, to augment, the teaching and residential sides or characteristics of the university. These characteristics exist already to a certain extent as, if I have not mistaken, my hon. and esteemed friend, Dr. Macphail, himself observed in the speech which he made at the time when the Bill was introduced. That there should be a fixed limit circumscribed, a tiny little area, as against the whole of the Presidency, a ten-mile radius, to augment and extend these characteristics is something which we in the mufassal cannot fully comprehend.

“My hon. and good friend, Professor Ratnaswami, paid me the compliment of being an idealist. And he said as an idealist I tidied over considerations of time and place. Idealists are those, Sir, who brush aside time and place and also environments and circumstances, and I beg to submit that those who are the authors of this Bill are the real idealists, for they want to tide over the existing conditions of a university which has been hitherto serving the whole province, by narrowing it down to a ten-mile area. It is not I that lost sight of time, place and circumstances, but it is they who say : ‘Hitherto the university has been serving the whole of this area ; but now we wish to start this new idea of a teaching and residential university at Madras within a ten-mile area ; and as for the mufassal colleges, they will be suffered as affiliated colleges till they are brought under the jurisdiction of some other university.’

[Mr. R. Venkataratnam Nayudu] [31st January 1923]

Clause 2—cont.

“ My hon. friend, Rao Bahadur O. Tanikachala Chettiyar, in the speech which he made in connexion with the motion for the introduction of this Bill, sought to enforce his arguments by a very engaging illustration appealing to the heart of every father, namely, that the marriageable daughters must first be married and the non-marriageable daughters must wait. No doubt it is a very appealing illustration. Only, I beg leave to point out that my hon. friend had taken for granted what he had to prove by facts, namely, that all the Madras colleges are marriageable and that all the mufassal colleges are of non-age. Really, Sir, if an illustration were needed, this is the illustration which I would use without meaning and I hope without causing any offence. Hitherto we have been in one vessel under one engineer, but now we are told that the time has come for installing better engines, to speed up and for giving elbow room, and therefore they say: ‘ Let the Madras colleges remain in and let the mufassal colleges go to Masula boats and *catamarans*’. That is the real situation, Sir, and as we are sent over, we wish to know whether there are not at least some mufassal colleges that could, for the sake of charity, be permitted to remain in the old vessel, and that only after a due investigation of all the available resources has been made.

“ The second point urged against this amendment is this, namely, that I have lost sight of the fact that it is only one university that we can handle at a time. I have not lost sight of that fact. On the other hand, I say there can be only one university. Just to illustrate my point I might state that it has been mentioned to me by several of my hon. friends that after the House had accepted the alternative or the substituted proposal of my hon. friend, Professor Arpudawami Udayar, there was no necessity for this amendment at all and that therefore it would be superfluous. Well, Sir, if I were prepared to dispose of this argument in only one word, I would say if the two are identical why pass that one and why object to this? But the two are not identical. The two are materially different. One is for the establishment of what are called ‘ university centres’, and it is common belief that when once a university centre is recognized by Government in a clear tangible way, Government will have committed itself to, more than promised, develop it before long into a university. And how many such university centres can there be in the whole of this Presidency? In view of the fact that obviously there can be only two or three universities at the most, Government will be, very rightly, extremely chary in recognizing any localities as university centres. Then, what is to become of the other mufassal colleges, if they are really good colleges that can shoulder the responsibilities of imparting what we consider advanced university education? Are they to be left out, or are they to wait till new university centres are established? I think in either case it would be demanding too much of self-repression. There are certain colleges which can soon take up this section of university life, namely, co-operating with the university in the matter of fostering academic life and corporate unity.

“ Sir, my memory just now fails me whether it was in the Statement of Objects and Reasons or in the preliminary speech with which my hon. friend, the Minister, introduced the Bill where it was stated that within the limits of the Madras University, as regards the colleges that were located



31st January 1923] [Mr. R. Venkataratnam Nayadu.]

*Clause 2—cont.*

therein, the training would be all in all, or the most essential thing, and examinations would be a very secondary factor, whereas in the case of the mufassal colleges the examination would be the prime factor and all that the university would do by way of controlling, guiding, or in any other way helping these affiliated colleges, would be to enable them to pass those examinations satisfactorily. So there is a real difference between constituent and affiliated colleges; and I claim that there are certain mufassal colleges which can adopt these new methods of training and produce academic life.

“Next, the other objections that have been raised: for instance, one objection has been raised by my hon. friend, the learned Member for the university, that the House allowed the Bill to go without a division at the first reading, and that therefore it ought not to object to its principles just now. Well, that was only a recognition of the fact that we thought that the Bill as a whole was very good and might therefore be allowed to go into the Select Committee. But on that account to commit us to every one of the principles of the Bill is asking us for more than we are prepared to grant. Then again it was observed that my proposal was tantamount to vesting in the Local Government freedom to establish new universities. I am not at all contemplating the establishment of any new university through this amendment. The amendment is wholly and solely intended for giving to some colleges the right to participate in the improved university life by being a constituent or an integral part of the university.

“Sir, the advantages of this amendment, if it should be kindly accepted by the House, are these. First, to adopt the happy language of my hon. friend, Professor Arpudaswami Udayar, it will be the pledge of the goodwill of the university towards mufassal colleges as constituent colleges, and then there will be absolutely no justification for grumbling that for the sake of mere convenience all the facilities of the new system are confined to the limits of the Madras city. Secondly, Sir, if the constituent colleges are really going to reflect the new university life and reproduce the new university methods, and if they really work up to the new university ideal, then, certainly, it will help to take away that congestion which is sure to ensue at Madras on the introduction of this Bill, if there exist similar facilities elsewhere. Certainly, there will be a crowding in of a number of students in much larger proportion than is the case now into Madras, because every one will feel that the kind of instruction given in Madras colleges is at least believed to be, if it is not really in fact, of a higher or better type, and therefore every one that could possibly help it should seek admission there. My hon. and esteemed friend, the Rev. Dr. Macphail, asked the question in his speech on the previous occasion: ‘If they come, where are they to be admitted?’ Sir, shall I not submit that that question provokes a counter-question? ‘Are you not bound to admit them?’ Bestowing upon the university to be established in Madras money taken from the rate-payers all over the Presidency, are you not under an obligation to take in all those that seek admission from all parts of the Presidency, provided they satisfy the academical pre-requisites? How is that question going to be solved? How is that difficulty going to be met? I believe here is a way which, though it may not be completely successful, yet offers, to

[Mr. R. Venkataratnam Nayudu] [31st January 1923]

*Clause 2—cont.*

a large extent, a practical solution of the difficulty. By recognizing, by helping and by fostering the spirit of what are called the constituent institutions in certain particular localities, you will be able to divert good many of those that come to Madras into those places and thus there will be provision for a larger number to get the benefits of the new system than will be possible, under any conditions, with this limitation of area.

"The third point is this: *other* mufassal colleges will feel that the university recognizes from the beginning, at any rate as soon as this is given effect to, the possibility and the potentiality of their coming up to constituent colleges. To have in the near neighbourhood a constituent college is to assure them that they, too, could become constituent colleges if they tried. Whereas, if it is a hard and fast line of demarcation, which can never be transgressed, that all constituent colleges should be within Madras and none outside Madras, then, naturally, it will mean that they can never aspire to become constituent Colleges and that they shall hold only a subordinate position. My hon. friend, Mr. Shaumukham Chettiyar, has said, as also, I believe, my hon. friend, the Raja of Ramnad, that if this proposal is given effect to, it will damp the local enthusiasm as regards the establishment of new universities, and it will work directly the opposite way. Sir, with the utmost deference to my hon. friends, I may say that the chances are that it will give a strong incentive, a stimulus to the local enthusiasm with the suggestion, your college is considered good enough for a constituent college; discharge your duties well and exert further and you will be good enough to be a university centre.' Therefore, Sir, I do believe that there is no harm done to the real intentions of this Bill by the Council adopting this amendment.

"Only one other word, Sir, I beg leave to say: and I hope you will kindly permit it, and I trust my hon. friends will not take it amiss. Somehow, Sir, I receive from different friends whispers of sympathy, but somehow that sympathy does not materialize when it comes to voting (Laughter.) Well, I dare say they have not yet made up their minds. I can only ask them to show it by remaining neutral when the matter comes to the vote, so that we may know how many are really *for* this amendment, how many *against* it, and what is the attitude that the Council as a whole really adopts."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"Sir, it is unnecessary for me to discuss this matter in all its details. The arguments against it have been very forcibly and eloquently put forward by Dr. Macphail and Mr. Lamalinga Reddi. Other speakers have also added what they have seen from their experience and objected to this amendment. In spite of the most praiseworthy eloquence of the hon. mover of this amendment, I may say that the goodwill of this House in regard to this Bill is shown to the mufassal colleges in accepting the amendment which has been proposed by the hon. Member Mr. Arpudaswami Udayar. If that is not a proof of the goodwill, I ask, Sir, how it could be that the Government would accept the offer of the mufassal colleges to determine what the future centres of universities should be according to the definition of the 'university centre', viz., that one or more colleges, if they are competent, should be recognized as university centres on the recommendation of the Senate? That is the first proof of the goodwill or the pledge of the goodwill of the university

3 p.m.



31st January 1923]

[Mr. A. P. Patro]

Clause 2—cont.

Bill to the mufassal colleges. Again, Sir, I shall draw the attention of hon. Members to clause 27, sub-clauses (f) and (g), in which full power is given to the Council of Affiliated Colleges to protect the interests of such mufassal colleges as come to the level described by the mover of this amendment. In clause 51 also we find another privilege or concession given to the Senate to move in the matter. So I find these three safeguards are three concessions that are given in favour or in protection of the interests of mufassal colleges, and yet, if we are asked why we have not sufficiently safeguarded the interests of the mufassal colleges, I am unable to understand it.

"Therefore, Sir, you will see that my first objection to the amendment is that it is consistent with the basic principle, on which the Bill has been framed, viz., that the University at Madras should be developed, that we should see the experiment, and, afterwards, when this local university has been successful, other areas should be included, and in the meanwhile other centres should be gradually developed into university centres. This being the principle of the Bill, if you extend the limits of the university to other places also, it destroys the fundamental principle on which this Bill has been framed. Consequently, as I told you, this amendment is unnecessary because safeguards have been provided in the amendment that has been accepted regarding university centres and in clauses 27 and 51 of this Bill. Therefore, Sir, I strongly object to this amendment."

The amendment was put to the House and declared lost.

Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu demanded a poll which was taken with the following result:—

Ayes.

- |  |                                       |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| 1. Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu. | 8. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo.     |
| 2. " L. A. Govindaraghava Ayyar.             | 9. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhacharlu. |
| 3. Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu.    | 10. Rao Sahib U. Rama Rao.            |
| 4. " C. V. S. Narasimha Raju.                | 11. Sriman Sasibhushan Rath Mahasayo. |
| 5. Mr. P. Siva Rao.                          | 12. Mr. M. R. Seturatuam Ayyar.       |
| 6. " C. V. Venkataratnam Ayyangar.           | 13. " R. Srinivasa Ayyangar.          |
| 7. Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu.    | 14. " T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar.       |
|  | 15. " M. Suryanarayana.               |
|  | 16. " T. Sivasankaram Pillai.         |

Noes.

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1. The hon. Sir Charles Todhunter.                         | 17. Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar.    |
| 2. " Khan Bahadur Sir Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur. | 18. Mr. M. Adinarayana Reddi.                 |
| 3. " the Raja of Panagal.                                  | 19. S. R. Y. Ankineedu Prasad Bahadur.        |
| 4. " Rai Bahadur E. Venkatarreddi Nayudu.                  | 20. Mr. M. Appalarasayya Nayudu.              |
| 5. " Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro.                              | 21. " R. Appaswami Nayudu.                    |
| 6. " Mr. A. R. Knapp.                                      | 22. Diwan Bahadur C. Arunachala Mudaliyar.    |
| 7. Mr. C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar.                              | 23. Rao Sahib S. Ellappa Chettiyar.           |
| 8. " E. S. Lloyd.  | 24. Diwan Bahadur Sir P. Tyagaraya Chettiyar. |
| 9. " A. Y. G. Campbell.                                    | 25. Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu.         |
| 10. Rev. Dr. E. M. Macphail.                               | 26. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar.          |
| 11. Mr. R. G. Grieve.                                      | 27. Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi.                   |
| 12. Rao Bahadur K. Ramunni Menon.                          | 28. Diwan Bahadur T. N. Sivaganam Pillai.     |
| 13. Mr. E. F. Thomas.                                      | 29. Rao Bahadur O. Tanikachala Chettiyar.     |
| 14. " E. Periyarayagam.                                    | 30. Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar.           |
| 15. Rao Sahib T. C. Tangavelu Pillai.                      | 31. " K. P. Gopala Menon.                     |
| 16. Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar.                            | 32. " K. A. Kandaswami Kandar.                |
|  | 33. " J. Kuppuswami.                          |

[31st January 1923]

Clause 2—cont.

Noes—cont.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 34. Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu.            | 52. Rev. W. Meston.                    |
| 35. " P. C. Muttu Chettiyar.            | 53. Mr. T. Arumainatha Pillai.         |
| 36. " M. Narayanaswami Reddi.           | 54. " A. T. Palmer.                    |
| 37. Rao Bahadur C. Natesa Mudaliyar.    | 55. " M. Ratnaswami.                   |
| 38. Mr. V. P. Pakkiriswami Pillai.      | 56. The Raja of Ramnad.                |
| 39. " P. T. Rajan.                      | 57. Sri Meka V. Apparao Bahadur.       |
| 40. Rao Bahadur A. Ramayya Punja.       | 58. Mr. K. Prabhakaran Tampam.         |
| 41. Mr. K. Sarabha Reddi.               | 59. A. D. M. Bavotti Sahib.            |
| 42. " W. P. A. Saundara Pandya Nadar.   | 60. A. P. I. Saiyid Ibrahim Ravuttar.  |
| 43. " R. K. Shanmukham Chettiyar.       | 61. Muhammad Abdur Rahim Khan Sahib.   |
| 44. " K. Sitarama Reddi.                | 62. Saiyid Diwan Abdul-Razzaq Sahib.   |
| 45. " T. Somasundara Mudaliyar.         | 63. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Sadulla      |
| 46. " S. Somasundaram Pillai.           | Badsha Sahib.                          |
| 47. Dr. P. Subbarayan.                  | 64. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib. |
| 48. Diwan Bahadur K. Suryanarayanamurti | 65. Mr. R. T. Kesavulu Pillai.         |
| Nayudu.                                 | 66. Rao Sahib M. C. Madurai Pillai.    |
| 49. Mr. A. Tangavelu Nayagar.           | 67. Mr. G. Vandanam.                   |
| 50. Rao Bahadur C. Venkata Ranga Reddi. | 68. Rao Sahib G. Venkatarangayya.      |
| 51. Mr. S. Muttumanikkachari.           |  |

Sixteen hon. Members voted *for* and sixty-eight *against* the amendment.

The motion was lost.

Sub-clause (i).

MR. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"My amendment is only formal, and I beg to move—

21. *For the words 'the degree examinations' substitute 'any degree examination'.*

"My reason is this. As it is, the sub-clause should necessarily mean that students should not be coached up for more than one degree examination. But there is the General Clauses Act which says that the singular may be taken as the plural and the plural as singular; however, it is better that it should be made clear, and so the words 'any degree examination' may be substituted. It is only a formal amendment."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—"I second it."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"The object of the hon. mover will be met by the omission of the word 'the' before the words 'degree examinations' when the clause will read

does not submit its students to degree examinations.

I shall accept such an amendment."

MR. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—"I may at once say that it seems to be all right as it stands. If necessary the word 'the' may be omitted."

MR. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar with the leave of the House withdrew his amendment in favour of Mr. C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar's amendment.

MR. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—"I move that—

*The word 'the' before the words 'degree examinations' be omitted.*"

MR. A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"I second it."

The amendment was put and carried.

Clause 2 as amended was put, passed and added to the Bill.



31st January 1923]

Clause 3.

Sub-clause (1).

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, I move—

23. That the word 'first' wherever it occurs may be omitted.

"The clause as it stands reads :

The first Chancellor, Pro-Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor of the University and the first members of the Senate, the Syndicate, . . . are hereby constituted a body corporate by the name of the University of Madras.

"We find in this Bill that so far as the Chancellor is concerned, the Governor of Madras is Chancellor *ex officio*. So far as the Pro-Chancellor is concerned, whoever is the Minister for Education is to be the Pro-Chancellor for the time being; even, he is an officer of the University. Therefore there is no meaning in saying that the first Chancellor, Pro-Chancellor and others shall constitute the University. There may be some justification if the word 'first' is confined to the Vice-Chancellor. But that is not within the scope of this clause.

"I may draw the attention of the House to the fact that even when universities were constituted in other places, 'first' was generally used in cases where specific appointments were made. For instance, in the Act constituting the Aligarh Muslim University you find :

The first Chancellor, Pro-Chancellor and the Vice-Chancellor who shall be the persons appointed in this behalf by notification in the *Gazette of India* and all persons who occupy such positions shall constitute the University.

"There you have some justification for the use of the word 'first'. But here, those who occupy the office occupy it by virtue of some other office. Similarly, I find 'first' used in the Act constituting the Benares Hindu University. Here again, there is justification for using the word, for the appointment of the Chancellor is made by virtue of a notification by the Governor-General, signifying that in future appointments they need not occupy the same position. If the mistake has crept into this Bill, I believe it is due to the fact that in a later Act constituting the Dacca University this mistake occurred and that seems to have been copied in the framing of this Bill. I submit that there ought to be no difficulty in eliminating the word 'first' as there is no meaning in retaining that word."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"I beg to second the amendment. This is only a question of language and not a question of principle. I think we may leave it to the Advocate-General."

3-15 p.m.

Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR (Advocate-General) :—"Sir, I may invite the attention of the House to the Act constituting the University of Madras in 1857. It says :

The first Chancellor and fellows and all persons, who may hereafter become Chancellor or Vice-Chancellor are hereafter to be constituted and declared the body politic.

"It was following that model that this sub-clause was drafted and not really following the Dacca model. But it seems to me that there can really be no controversy in the matter. There are certain persons who are constituted functionaries. They and their successors are to be the body politic.

[Mr. C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar]

[31st January 1923]

*Clause 3—cont.*

So, I think the language as it stands serves the purpose already and that unless some more radical objections are taken I do not see any reason why the amendment should be accepted."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" If it is a matter of drafting, I should like to bring to the notice of the hon. the Advocate-General—I am speaking from my recollection—the fact that the schedule of the Act constituting the Madras University mentions by name . . . . "

Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR (Advocate-General) :—" It is true that the Act constituting the Madras University gives a list of persons who are to be nominated Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor and so forth."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" My point is that the Act contains a schedule which mentions the names of the first Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, etc., who are to form themselves into a corporate body for the purpose of forming a university. Similarly, in the case of the other Act to which my hon. friend referred, the Benares Hindu University Act, there was a notification by the Government of India mentioning by name the persons who should form the Benares University. In the Aligarh University Act also the word 'first' is very appropriate because, the first persons were made either by the Statute or by notification by the Government of India. These persons next proceeded to devise the machinery for their succession. But where these officers are ex officio, we ought to see whether the word 'first' is appropriate. After all our object is to make the Statute as good as possible. So, if the hon. the Advocate-General thinks that the word is not appropriate, I request him to accept the amendment."

Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR (Advocate-General) :—" May I make a further remark by way of explanation? It is just because the first of these bodies come into existence earlier this word was used. In order to make it clear the word 'first' was felt necessary."

The amendment was by leave withdrawn.

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO—" I beg to move—

24. *Omit the word 'Pro-Chancellor'.*

"The Select Committee that sat upon this Bill made the new appointment of Pro-Chancellor. I do not know the reason that prompted the Committee to do so except that, in the report that is given, the Committee decided, following the precedents of modern universities in Great Britain and India, to have a Pro-Chancellor. They followed these universities as far as the Pro-Chancellor was concerned but not in other things. The step which the Select Committee took is a very unfortunate and retrograde one. Evidently, the Committee have forgotten that as Minister of Education he may agree with the proposals of the Senate, but as a member of the Legislative Council he may not carry them through. In such a case his position would be very awkward. Further, Sir, the University must be an autonomous body; instead of that, as it is, it will be a department of Government. For instance, the Governor will be the Chancellor, the Minister of Education will be Pro-Chancellor, and there will be a paid Vice-Chancellor. All these put together, the University will be a department of



31st January 1923] [Mr. U. Rama Rao]

Clause 3—cont.

Government under the Minister. This it ought not to be. Then again, if the clause is passed as it is, and if you are going to have universities all over the Presidency, I want to know if the Minister of Education will be Pro-Chancellor for all the universities. That is an absurd thing to do. With these few words I move the amendment."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—" I second it."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" As the report of the Select Committee says, the appointment of the Pro-Chancellor was introduced by the Select Committee following the precedents of modern universities both in Great Britain and in India; it is entirely left to the House to have it or reject it. It is not a matter for me to discuss in detail; but, as the Select Committee has thought it fit to introduce it, I am bound to support it."

Diwan Bahadur L. A. GOVINDARAGHAVA AYYAR :—" Now, Sir, that we find the hon. the Minister in charge of Education is not very keen about the appointment, and whether the amendment is passed or not, I believe that the House is in a more unembarrassed position than it would be if the Minister had insisted upon this amendment being rejected. But that does not mean that the amendment should be accepted or rejected except on reasonable grounds. Of course the fact that the Select Committee has accepted the appointment is a point in favour of the rejection of the amendment; but I trust that the reasons given will indicate to the House that this amendment should be accepted by the House.

" In the first place the fact that other universities have Pro-Chancellors does not conclude this question; for the exact functions of the Pro-Chancellor and the Chancellor in this and other universities have to be considered before the need for a Pro-Chancellor is felt. In the present case the House will recognise that the functions of the Pro-Chancellor are to act in the absence of the Chancellor. The House will see that in sub-clause 2 of clause 10 it is said :

In the absence of the Chancellor or during the Chancellor's inability to act, the Pro-Chancellor shall exercise all the functions of the Chancellor.

" The position is this: The Pro-Chancellor is, as it were, a deputy or an *alias* to the Chancellor; he will begin to function when the Chancellor is unable, i.e., either when he is absent or when he is unable, to act. What exactly is meant by the Chancellor being absent I am not quite able to understand, because there is another statutory declaration found in clause 9 which says that the Chancellor of the University shall be the Governor of Madras. There ought to be a Governor of Madras, and if there is a Governor of Madras, *ex officio* he becomes the Chancellor, so that what exactly is meant by the absence of the Chancellor requires some explanation. Then again, Sir, it is said that the Pro-Chancellor will act during the Chancellor's inability to act. What are the circumstances in which the Chancellor will be unable to act and it will be necessary for the Pro-Chancellor to step into his shoes? That also, I submit, is not made clear. If these are the two occasions when the Pro-Chancellor is to act, my submission is he is altogether an unnecessary officer.

[Mr. L. A. Govindaraghava Ayyar] [31st January 1923]

*Clause 3—cont.*

“ But this does not conclude the question in favour of the amendment. It may be that this is a harmless provision which can be allowed to stand, although nobody sees any utility for it; but my submission is that the provision is full of harm. My reason is this: It will be noticed that there are some functions which are assigned to the local Government with respect to the doings of the University. There are some provisions by which it is competent for the University to make recommendations, but it is the Local Government that has ultimately to decide them. Obviously the Pro-Chancellor, the Minister of Education, will be the person who will do the function of the Government in judging of the recommendations of the University, and it is I think somewhat unfortunate that the Pro-Chancellor should be placed in a rather ambiguous or invidious position by being responsible for the doings of the University and also for the decision of the Government. It is, I think, in his interest that he should be allowed a free opportunity and a free chance for exercising his independent judgment over the deliberations of the University. On the other hand, it may be possible for him to meddle in the affairs of the University independently of the chance he possesses as the Minister for Education and, therefore, as the Member who has the portfolio of Education. For these reasons it seems to me that nothing will be gained by retaining the provision, that something will be lost by insisting upon its retention, and that the mere example of other universities—there are some which do not have this—is not a sufficient reason why we should have it. If I may respectfully say so, the introduction of the Pro-Chancellor in this scheme will be something like the introduction of a fifth wheel in the coach.”

MR. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“ I understood the hon. the Minister to say that the Select Committee took this step following the precedents of modern universities in Great Britain and India. If he has some precedents in this respect, I feel bound to place before the House some precedents unfavourable to the position taken up by the Select Committee. The Dacca University and the Aligarh University are recently created universities. The Dacca University was created by an Act in 1920 and that Act does not provide for a Pro-Chancellor. The Aligarh University Act also does not contain any provision to this effect. Therefore the precedents seem to be divided, and so far as I am concerned, I can lay my hand upon two modern universities constituted or created between 1920 and 1921 which do not contemplate or countenance the appointment or the creation of that office. Therefore I beg leave to support this motion.”

Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB :—“ Sir, I beg to oppose the amendment. No case has been made out for the abolition of this office of Pro-Chancellor. According to this Bill, there will be a Vice-Chancellor who will be an official of the University, and therefore it is quite desirable that there should be a Pro-Chancellor who will, according to this Bill, be the Minister for Education. All the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor to the Chancellor will have to pass through the hon. the Minister for Education who is responsible to this House. As the House is aware, the Minister for Education is responsible to this House for education generally, and it will be advantageous if he holds an office in the

3-30 p.m.



31st January 1923] [Muhammad Usman Sahib]

*Clause 3—cont.*

university, for then he could bring the opinion of this Council to bear on the transactions of the Senate. Further, there is a special necessity for the retention of the office of Pro-Chancellor from the point of view of Muhammadans. It will be observed that no special provision is made anywhere in the Bill for the special representation of the Muhammadan community. Seeing that the Muhammadans have only to come by the door of nomination, it is a very wise step to have the hon. the Minister for Education as Pro-Chancellor, for he can see that adequate representation is given to all the minorities. I think it is very important that we should keep the office of Pro-Chancellor in the constitution of the University. I therefore strongly support the recommendation of the Select Committee and oppose the amendment now before the House."

The Rev. Dr. E. M. MACPHAIL :—"I do not feel that there was any very great reason for having a Pro-Chancellor in addition to the Chancellor and the Vice-Chancellor, and when the proposal was made in the Select Committee that the Minister for Education should be the permanent Pro-Chancellor, I felt I could not subscribe to it. I am entirely opposed to the idea of the Minister for Education being a permanent official of the Madras University. I am sorry to have to differ from some of my hon. friends on this point, but I do not think that it is desirable that the gentleman who is the Minister for Education should really hold a permanent office in the University. We are apt to get the University mixed up with politics and we may have awkward conditions arising such as we sometimes see in other universities. Because I have that feeling—although I have no great objection to the post of Pro-Chancellor in itself—because I feel that this post is proposed chiefly in order that the Minister for Education might be put in, I am not going to oppose the amendment at all."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—"Sir, I rise to oppose the amendment. In doing so, I must begin with a personal confession. For obvious reasons, the hon. the Minister for Education, to whom I myself suggested this idea, did not like to take the responsibility for introducing it. I wanted not merely this academic post, but I also wanted that a constitutional association should be built up between the University and the Minister for Education. Therefore when the question arose, the hon. Minister for Education kept an open mind and left to me the responsibility for its initiation and piloting. I proposed it in the Select Committee, and there was a good deal of discussion on the subject. As the points raised by my hon. friend, Mr. Govindaraghava Ayyar, are almost the same as those that were raised in the Select Committee, I had better give the same reply as was then given.

"The first question to be dealt with is, is this an academical post or is it not? As was pointed out by some of my hon. friends, the precedents in regard to this are divided. Well, while precedents are divided we cannot say that it is not an academical post. It is true that the two particular universities that my hon. friend, Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar, singled out for special mention on this occasion, do not have this post; but if we take a wider survey of the Indian Universities, it will be found that the Pro-Chancellorship does exist in the Benares Hindu University and in one

[Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi] [31st January 1923]

## Clause 3—cont.

other university, which, as was well suggested this morning, might serve an admirable model for the Madras University, and that is the Mysore University.

“Then, it has been asked that if there is this association between the Minister and the Pro-Chancellor, will not awkward situations arise? This question must be dealt with from that point of view, and I may at once state that the function of that officer is to secure the smoothest possible working between the University and the Government. As regards the invidious situation, may I point out that it can arise even now, because every hon. Member of the Government of Madras is also *ex officio* a member of the Senate of the Madras University and cannot the same awkward situations arise from their taking part in the deliberations of the Senate as Fellows of the University and also by their passing orders on the recommendations of the University as heads of the Government? Well, I can point out that the present Vice-Chancellor was certainly attending the Senate and taking part in its deliberations and even in the elections and at the same time, he was also sitting in appellate jurisdiction over the various recommendations that were sent up by the Senate. In so far as there is any such invidious situation, we are not creating anything *de novo*, but we are only continuing the existing situation which has not been found in actual practice either impossible or intolerable. If my hon. friend, Dr. Macphail, would but ponder for one moment, he would see that from the constitutional aspect, it is far more objectionable to allow the Vice-Chancellorship to be held by a member of the Executive Council than the sort of thing that I have in view. I do not wish to make any observations which will in any way look like lowering the tone of the debate; but it has been remarked by more than one gentleman both here and outside how unfortunate we have been in that the hon. the Vice-Chancellor who is here could not take any part in the deliberations on the question of the reconstitution of the University. It may be asked, what relation do we expect this association of the Minister for Education with the University to have on its smooth working? Sir, the main reason why I wanted this measure to be adopted is this. I have been following very closely the unfortunate differences which have arisen in Bengal between the Minister for Education and the Calcutta University. I have not only read almost all the literature bearing on that subject, but I have had, even the temerity to write an article on that subject which appeared in a recent issue of the *Calcutta Review*. It struck me on a close perusal of all those documents that what really happened was a misunderstanding between the University and the Government as represented by the Minister for Education. It struck me that if only the Minister for Education had a definite constitutional association with the University, it would have tended to its smoother working. After all, the Chancellor is the head of the Government and I really do not see how it would involve a greater violation of principle if the Minister for Education is allowed to be the Pro-Chancellor than it would involve if the Governor who is the head of the Government is allowed to be the Chancellor. I am sure that the Minister for Education in the office of Pro-Chancellor will, far from becoming meddlesome, be only the opposite of it, that is, he will become very sympathetic. It was chiefly as an administrative measure, as one that would tend to the smooth working



31st January 1923] [Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi]

*Clause 3—cont.*

of the university that I advocated this. I thought that would be one of the ways of ensuring the university getting the assistance that it would be in need of.

“It was also pointed out that there was no necessity for the office of Pro-Chancellor, because it was not in the old constitution. The Bill, as it was presented to the House, contemplated a paid Vice-Chancellor and that was the only officer between the Chancellor as head of the Government and the University. Between the Chancellor who as the head of the Government has to attend to so many duties and the Vice-Chancellor who according to the Bill is a paid official, there will be no intermediary of the kind that would, from the university point of view, be an honorary official and yet possess sufficient authority to be able to meet the head of the Government and carry out successfully the recommendations of the university. For all these reasons, I think it is very desirable to have this post. Purely from an administrative point of view, I think it is one of those small matters which would tend to the smooth working of the university and to the safeguarding of the future autonomy of our university. If you intend a university to be autonomous, it becomes necessary as a precautionary measure to try to minimize all possible friction between the Government and that body. Anyhow, since the Chancellor, as the head of the Government, is there, it does not mean any abnormal expedient or anything to which exception could be taken on principle if we introduce the Minister for Education as Pro-Chancellor. For these reasons, Sir, I think it would be well if we accept the recommendations of the Select Committee and reject the amendment.”

Mr. P. SIVA RAO :—“Sir, I heartily support the amendment. In fact, I have also given notice of a similar amendment and I take this opportunity of saying a few words on this subject. This post of Pro-Chancellor was not included in the Bill as it was presented to the House and the hon. the Minister has with an open mind rightly left this point to be decided by the Members of this House. The provision for this appointment was, for the first time, made in the Select Committee stage. Now I have heard from my hon. friend, Mr. Ramalinga Reddi, the circumstances under which this post was included in the Bill. Under the Bill as it was presented to the House, there was only the Chancellor and a paid Vice-Chancellor and now the Pro-Chancellor is introduced. What are the functions of this Pro-Chancellor? In the Bill it is stated that in the absence of the Chancellor or during the Chancellor's inability to act, the Pro-Chancellor shall exercise all the functions of the Chancellor. I do not know, Sir, whether that contingency will ever arise. Not only has the office of Pro-Chancellor been created, but also the Minister for Education is made the ex officio Pro-Chancellor. Now, Sir, there are more reasons than one why the Minister for Education should not be a functionary of the university. As my hon. friend, Dr. Macphail, stated, it would amount to the Minister compromising his position and he would be placed in awkward and delicate situations. As Minister, he will have to sit in judgment over the recommendations of the university and he will be in an anomalous position as Pro-Chancellor of the same university whose recommendations come to him in another sphere. We all desire that there should be as little interference with the affairs of the university as possible, and I am afraid that the creation of this post does not tend to foster the independence and the academic freedom of the university.”

[Mr. P. Siva Rao]

[31st January 1923]

*Clause 3—cont.*

3-45 p.m. “My hon. friend, Mr. Ramalinga Reddi, suggested that the creation of the post of Pro-Chancellor would tend to smoothen the working of the university, and that if the university was taken up as a department of the Government, it would tend to the successful working of the machinery. But I am afraid that should not be the point of view from which we should consider this question. My motto is that the Minister for Education, so far as university affairs are concerned, should have his ‘hands off’; for, how can he perform two important functions at one and the same time? If he takes an active part in the debates of the university, how can he hope to perform his supervisory functions as responsible to the Legislative Council? He cannot be a permanent functionary of the university. I am afraid the Minister for Education will find himself placed in an awkward situation if the university takes one view and he has to take another view as head of the Government. I am sorry to see that my hon. friend wants to stifle all such differences. He wants to merge the two functions in one officer and then say there is no difference of opinion whatever. I do not think it is a very desirable state of affairs to contemplate.

“My hon. friend, Mr. Muhammad Usman, suggested that this functionary is quite essential to look after the interests of the minorities. May I point out to him that the power of nomination vests in the Chancellor and not in the Vice-Chancellor or the Pro-Chancellor? My submission is that the Minister for Education should keep himself aloof so that he may take a dispassionate view on the recommendations of the university which he cannot possibly do if he mixes himself up in the university affairs. I therefore think it is most undesirable that the Minister for Education should take the post of Pro-Chancellor.”

Rao Bahadur O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—“I beg to oppose the amendment. We have been attempting, at least most of us have been attempting, to advance and bring ourselves into line with the latest Universities in Europe and America. What else was expected of the Sadler Commission except to have a reformation of the Calcutta University more in consonance with what is prevailing in the West.

“As regards the suggestion that a Government Member should act in the capacity of a Pro-Chancellor, what is the present state of things? If we are willing to have at present one of the Executive Councillors as Vice-Chancellor, what objection is there for the Minister in charge of Education being on the academic body. In fact when Dr. Sadler was Vice-Chancellor in the University of Leeds, there was also a Pro-Chancellor, and there is still a Pro-Chancellor there. I have a Calendar relating to the University of Bristol in which I find a list of officers. There is one Chancellor, the Right hon. Viscount Haldane. There are three Pro-Chancellors, the Right hon. Henry Hobhouse, George A. Wills, the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Bristol, and more than that we find a Vice-Chancellor and a Pro-Vice-Chancellor; and among the duties which are defined to be performed by Pro-Chancellors this is what the Calendar says:

There shall be a Pro-Chancellor or Pro-Chancellors of the University who or any one of whom may, subject to the Statutes of the University, in the absence of the Chancellor or pending a vacancy in the office of Chancellor, exercise the functions of the Chancellor except the conferring of degrees or the appointment of Members of the Court and may preside at meetings of the Court or Council.



31st January 1923] [Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar]

*Clause 3—cont.*

and with reference to the Pro-Vice-Chancellor the Calendar says :

There shall be a Pro-Vice-Chancellor of the University. He shall be subject to the Statutes of the University Act for the Vice-Chancellor pending a vacancy in that office or during the absence or inability of the Vice-Chancellor and shall when so acting confer degrees.

Now, undoubtedly when conferring degrees, His Excellency the Governor, if he is present, will preside. Is it not therefore desirable that, on an occasion when unfortunately the Chancellor is absent, in order to confer degrees, one occupying the position of a Pro-Chancellor rather than the paid Vice-Chancellor should preside? Moreover, in the circumstances in which we are situated, it will, in my opinion, be wise in the interests of proper representation and in the interests of minorities, if we are represented there by one who is in close touch with the feelings and ways of the people and that he should be an adviser to the Chancellor rather than that the Chancellor should be advised by the Vice-Chancellor and act on his recommendation. Moreover it has been pointed out that owing to the exigencies of business the Chancellor may unavoidably be absent; and in that case the Pro-Chancellor may preside and conduct the business. Thus any misunderstanding or friction which is sometimes said to arise otherwise between the Government and the University may be lessened. With these few words I oppose the amendment."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"It is not possible to consider this amendment unless we consider along with this all the provisions of the Bill. Regarding the Pro-Chancellor, the present motion suggests that a Pro-Chancellor should be appointed and we find subsequent provisions to the effect that he should be the Minister in charge of Education, subject to the notification for the time being. I think, in the interests of the University, the Government and Education, it is not desirable that one who is a Minister for the time being should be a Pro-Chancellor. Very properly the hon. Mr. C. R. Reddi and Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar have pointed out that we have a Member of the Executive Council as Vice-Chancellor—a very inconvenient and disadvantageous position. We all agree that, so far as this point is concerned, Government have associated themselves with the direct management of the university. If we realize that position, are we to go back upon the principle and introduce a departure from the accepted common principles?"

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—"I did not say inconvenient and disadvantageous position."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"I wish to point out that I did not want any Member of the Government to be in direct touch with the affairs of the university. I shall presently show the line of difference between these positions. I realize that in clause 19 there is no provision showing that the Members of the Executive Council or of the Executive Government should not be ex officio members of the Senate. In incorporating the several provisions in the present Bill, we have guarded against a wholesale departure from the previous constitution. We have tried to make this business as non-official and autonomous as possible. Having accepted that policy of departure whereby, except that the affairs of the university are to be controlled by the Chancellor who shall be the Governor of Madras, there shall be no official interference, should we adopt a principle whereby the

[Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu] [31st January 1923]

*Clause 3—cont.*

Minister in charge of Education should interfere with the affairs of the university? I think that if these principles are accepted, namely, that we should make these bodies as autonomous and independent as possible, it is not desirable that we should have on the permanent staff of the university an official. Though he is a Minister and an elected representative of the people there is still this difference between these two positions, which we cannot but recognize that this official for the time being is an adviser to the Government and is one of the members of the Cabinet who has to take part in a number of affairs. Having stated so much, that so far as the university is concerned, may I point out that if you put the Minister in charge of Education as the Pro-Chancellor he will not be in a position to take a dispassionate view of all the affairs of the university and to set matters right wherever necessary. If on the other hand, you have a permanent official as Pro-Chancellor who is acquainted with all the details of the administration he will be placed in a very awkward and inconvenient position. Therefore, in the face of all these things, it is not desirable that we should have the Minister in charge of Education as Pro-Chancellor."

Mr. A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" Let the question be put."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I do not want to interfere in the course of the debate. At present the discussion should centre round this : Should the University have a Pro-Chancellor? In clause 3 nothing is said as to who is to be the Pro-Chancellor or what functions he has to exercise. A great deal of discussion has arisen as to the propriety or otherwise of the Minister in charge of Education being the Pro-Chancellor. At present we are dealing with clause 3, which reads :

The First Chancellor, Pro-Chancellor, and Vice-Chancellor of the University . . .

The proposal is to omit the word 'Pro-Chancellor'. The only thing that is relevant is : is or is not a Pro-Chancellor necessary? The amendments coming later on cover the other question as to whether the Minister for Education should be the Pro-Chancellor, etc., and I hope that when those amendments come up, hon. Members will consider that the speeches that will then be needed have already been delivered." (Laughter).

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" I am thankful to you, Sir, for having directed our attention to the later amendments which call into question the propriety or the policy of appointing the Minister in charge of Education as Pro-Chancellor. A good deal has been said already on this subject and I believe I shall have to reserve my remarks under your ruling to the time when these amendments are moved. For the present I shall only express my views on one or two aspects of this question.

" The first of these is that my hon. friend, Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi, said that he discovered the usefulness of this officer and put forward this idea to the Minister who was in charge of this Bill. Well, Sir, we are thankful for that information and I am anxious to be supplied with some more information on this question."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—" I did not supply the information at the request of my hon. friend, Sir. In fact, I volunteered it."



31st January 1923]

Clause 3—cont.

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"No, not at all.

4 p.m.

My hon. Friend may refuse to answer it. He has also another alternative: he may ignore it, if he likes. But having said that he was wholly responsible for the proposal, I should like to ask him, or rather address myself to the Council, as to the necessity for this appointment. Hon. Members are aware that there was a draft Bill which was put in circulation and I believe Sir, that my hon. friend, if I may venture to say so, was also partly, may I say, consulted with regard to that Bill."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—"I do not think my hon. friend has any right to say so."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, I won't say that he was consulted, but I shall say there was a draft in which there was no provision made at all for a Pro-Chancellor. May I ask my hon. friend who now says that there is a necessity for the appointment of such an officer as to when he discovered the necessity for the Pro-Chancellor? I think, Sir, the real need for the appointment of Pro-Chancellor—whatever may be this particular amendment—arose really out of considerations for the appointment of the hon. the Minister for Education as Pro-Chancellor. Though I do not want to discuss that matter, there is no doubt whatever so far as I can judge it, that the necessity for the Pro-Chancellor was felt by those who were responsible for this proposal apparently because of the necessity for associating the hon. the Minister for Education with the University administration. But that question I shall reserve."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—"I am sorry to interrupt my hon. friend, Sir. I shall only say how superfluous such a limitation is when even under the present constitution all Members of the Government, including the hon. Ministers, are members of the Senate."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"I am quite aware of that, Sir, but we are now having a new constitution in which no Member of the Government and no Minister will be a member of the Senate. That being so, the question arose as to how the Minister for Education could ex officio be brought as Pro-Chancellor."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—"Perhaps I have not made myself clear, Sir. They are there now only by nomination. It is only by a convention of the University that they are nominated, but they are not ex officio members."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"There is absolutely no difficulty whatever either in my understanding my hon. friend, or in his understanding my point that they are not ex officio members of the Senate. The members of the Executive Council and the Ministers are appointed by nomination. The point is this. The whole policy of the Saddler Commission was the dissociation, as far as possible, of Government from University administration. Their function, according to that, as I understand it, was really a function of visitation and not of actual day-to-day administration. That is the general trend of opinion I was able to form about the Saddler Commission's report. My friend, Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar, referred to the Saddler Commission's report. I may perhaps point out to him that the Saddler Commission never recommended a Pro-Chancellor."

[31st January 1923]

*Clause 3—cont.*

Rao Bahadur O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—"I said, Sir, that in the Leeds University with which Dr. Saddler was connected, there was no objection to his being a Vice-Chancellor."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"My friend did refer to the Saddler Commission's report and he did refer to the Saddler Commission as authority. Now, as regards the point that there is a Pro-Chancellor or Vice-Chancellor in the University of Leeds or Bristol is certainly no argument that there should be a Pro-Chancellor in this University. It is a question of the necessity for such appointment, and so far as we have been able to see, the creation of this new appointment has not been justified on any ground whatsoever."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"Sir, I did not want to intervene in this debate, but one observation which was made by my friend, M. Ramachandra Rao, makes me say one or two words. If I heard my friend correctly, he stated that the idea of having a Pro-Chancellor was suggested for the purpose of enabling the Minister for Education to be made the Pro-Chancellor. Seeing that my friend has stated that, I may, with the permission of my colleagues in the Select Committee, reveal this fact, viz., that when it was suggested in the Select Committee that the Minister for Education should be ex officio Pro-Chancellor, my friend the hon. the Minister was protesting against it more than once, and the Select Committee made the Education Minister ex officio Pro-Chancellor, not on account of Mr. Patro's desiring it, but in spite of his protest. This information, I think, may be of some use to my hon. friends in the House in coming to a conclusion on this resolution."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"I must say a word of explanation in answer to my friend Mr. Krishnan Nayar. I must in the first place congratulate my hon. friend for having crossed the floor of the House again and for his vigorous defence of the Ministerial measure. Even apart from it, I have never said a word that Mr. Patro desired, or wanted, or suggested, that he should be made a Pro-Chancellor, and that this particular provision was made at his instance, or to satisfy his desire to be associated with the University administration. I think my hon. friend did say that. He is entirely mistaken. I never said so and I may perhaps also inform him that I was also a member of the Select Committee."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"May I be permitted to say just a word of personal explanation, Sir? My friend referred to my crossing the floor of the House. He knows, or in any case ought to know, Sir, that the arrangement regarding seating is vested absolutely in your discretion. I have crossed the floor in accordance with your directions and I am prepared to obey your direction in this and other matters always" (laughter).

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I may also, perhaps, give a word of explanation. I think this is a most unfortunate discussion. The seating of members is within the discretion of the President and I may say that until now I have found that members have been most helpful to me in carrying out my wishes in regard to their seating. I think hon. Members will bear me out when I say that in so seating them I have deferred as far as I could to their wishes in the matter (laughter). It is true that the seating of the members is a



31st January 1923]

[The President]

Clause 3—cont.

thing within the discretion of the President, but I think a little reflection will show that there is a method in it and that it is being done under certain well-established principles.

“Then, as regards the hon. Member himself, there is really no harm in a man crossing the floor of the House when such distinguished men as Gladstone and Chamberlain had crossed the floor of the House, and the hon. Mr. Krishnan Nayar may well be satisfied with being in their company. Inasmuch as this matter has come up, I think the hon. Member will bear me out when I say that in the note I sent to him I adduced reasons as to why I thought that his sitting in the front Opposition Bench might not be quite proper after a certain event. I do not propose to take the House into my confidence in regard to the reasons I gave. I do not think that the House is entitled to have those reasons, but I believe I explained to the hon. Member why, under certain circumstances, I thought that it would be more proper that he should sit in the Ministerial block.

“I think he will bear me out again when I say that he in return also expressed his concurrence and desired to have the particular place he now occupied. I simply say that in order to make the matter clear. I think I can mention instances of a number of hon. Members suggesting from time to time that they will be more comfortable in some other place than where they are. There is no harm in it at all and I do not think any of us need take it as a serious matter.”

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“In regard to that matter, may I say one word, Sir?”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“Yes.”

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“Thank you, Sir. In following your worthy example, I do not propose to take my hon. colleagues of this Council into my confidence or into your confidence as to why I came over here. But this I may say, and I believe there is no harm in revealing this fact, that originally, as you may remember, Sir, and as my friends also may remember, my seat was there (pointing to the first block). Many months ago in accordance with my request and for the reason that, being seated there I could not hear the speeches of the hon. the Government Members, I requested you to give me a seat there (pointing to the third block). It was for that reason and for that reason alone, apart from any party purpose whatever, that with your kind consent, Sir, I got a seat there (pointing again to the third block). Subsequently, for reasons which you have, if I may say so, naturally and reasonably stated should not be revealed to the House, you asked me whether I would like to have a seat here or any other seat, and responding to your natural kindness, I had not the least hesitation in occupying the seat which you suggested and it is in these circumstances, Sir, that I find myself here.”

MR. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—“On reflection, Sir, I find I must say a word of personal explanation on the position taken up by Mr. Ramachandra Rao. Putting all the matters together, I am constrained to think that he has certainly delivered an attack on my personal honour. He has said in so many words that those who have been responsible for this proposal have put it forward, for securing a berth for the hon. the Minister for Education in the

[Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi]

[31st January 1923]

*Clause 3—cont.*

University. The House will give me credit for this, I am sure, that whatever I have done in regard to this matter has been done in the interests of the University and not in the interests of any person whatsoever" (cheers).

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"I think I may at once assure my hon. friend that I never made any imputation on his personal honour, nor did I intend, either by implication, expressly, or directly or indirectly or in any other manner, to suggest anything unworthy of my hon. friend. I know that he is actuated by the best of motives and I regret that he should have said that I delivered an attack on his personal honour. I never made and never wanted to make any such attack."

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU :—"Mr. President, Sir, 4-15 p.m. I hope as I support this amendment I shall not be taken to task for crossing the floor of the House. The fact, Sir, is that this is not the first time that I am crossing the floor of the House. During the absence of the Deputy President, Mr. Kesava Pillai, you were pleased to invite me, Sir, more than once to cross over to the other side. After all, Sir, I do believe that it would have been better, if I may venture to say so, if my hon. friend, Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu, had not said the particular thing he did say, because I first understood him to state not quite what he meant. Now that the matter has been cleared up, I congratulate all concerned.

"I have already submitted that I am in favour of this amendment, and somehow, Sir, perhaps there is some innate perversity in me which makes me think that the arguments urged for it are really against it. It has been said, Sir, that there is the existing situation of one of the Executive Councillors being the Vice-Chancellor, without any difficulty arising. But there are two distinct points of difference. One is that he is not an ex-officio incumbent and the second that he is not a Pro-Chancellor. He is not there in virtue of his office. He was a Vice-Chancellor long before he became a Member of the Council. As regards the Pro-Chancellor, it has been said that it is the absence of such an arrangement that has given rise to the present unfortunate position in Bengal. As regards the real consequences of that situation there may be a difference of opinion, whether the situation is really unfortunate or fortunate though for the time being it may look 'uncanny'. I think that the present situation is tending to augment the autonomy of that University and, therefore, I do believe that the present situation is more helpful in that way than it would be were the Minister there ex-officio. It has been said that Dr. Saddler himself was the Vice-Chancellor of a University. Perhaps, if I may indulge in a bit of sophistry, that is exactly the reason why we should not have it because Dr. Saddler would not propose a Pro-Chancellor among the officers of the University. Then there is this consideration, namely, that at present all the members of the Executive Council are ex-officio members of the Senate and it has been felt, if I have judged the situation aright, rather unfortunate on both sides that there should be such a situation. They have always tried to minimise the difficulty by keeping themselves aloof, independent of the suggestion of some of us in the new Bill that the Members of Government should be scrupulously excluded from the fellowship of the University. If, therefore, it is desirable that Members of Government ought



31st January 1923] [Mr. R. Venkataratnam Nayudu]

Clause 3—cont.

not to be *ex-officio* members of the Senate, I suppose the argument will apply with greater force that a Member of Government ought not to be an *ex-officio* Pro-Chancellor.

"Then, again, Sir, it has been said that mediation between the Government and the University would be desirable and that the *ex-officio* Pro-Chancellor would be the proper medium. I should rather think that he would be the most improper medium, because he was already a Member of Government. It has also been said that should the Minister be *ex-officio* Pro-Chancellor, there is great chance of sympathy for the minorities. Well, that depends upon, I believe, the particular person. To-morrow there may be as Pro-Chancellor a Minister who may be dead-set against these communal representations. Normally, I think, it is not desirable that there should be this *ex-officio* Pro-Chancellor. Then it was asked whether or not there should be a Pro-Chancellor and the analogies of certain universities were cited. I wish to know whether there is any appreciable number of such universities in the world where also the Chancellor is an *ex-officio* Chancellor, the Governor of a Province. In the majority of cases, so far as I know, where there are Pro-Chancellors, the Chancellors are more or less temporary; that is to say, persons who are elected, or come in by virtue of nomination or processes of that kind. Under these circumstances, Sir, and chiefly in view of the consideration urged by my hon. friend, Dr. Macphail, I am altogether against this office of Pro-Chancellor, especially should it be added by way of a proviso that the Pro-Chancellor should be the Minister of Education for the time being. I may point out, Sir, that I was a member of the Select Committee and I voted against it. I still hold that opinion."

MR. M. RATNASWAMI:—"I have only one observation to make. As an abstract principle, I would certainly be opposed to all interference by Government in a university. But we are not dealing with private autonomous universities. The Madras University is a State university mostly supported by endowments from the State, and those who are responsible for the grant of such support should be allowed to have something to do with the university. Then, Sir, human nature should also be taken into reckoning. It is quite possible that a Minister who stands apart from the university will be as generous towards the university and as sympathetic towards the university as one who forms part of the university. But I think it is also arguable that a Minister who is in the university may be expected to be more sympathetic than one who is outside it. Speaking for myself, this is one of the suggestions upon which one may be indifferent without affecting the general principles of the Bill. But, certainly, I cannot understand the dead-set that is being made against the inclusion of the Minister for Education as an official of the university."

The motion was put and declared lost.

A poll was demanded and the House divided as follows:—

Ayes.

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1. Rev. Dr. E. M. Macphail.                    | 4. Diwan Bahadur L. A. Govindaraghav Ayyar. |
| 2. Diwan Bahadur K. Suryanarayanamurti Nayudu. | 5. Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu.   |
| 3. Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu.   | 6. Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimha Raju      |

[31st January 1923]

Clause 3—cont.

Ayes—cont.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 7. Mr. P. Siva Rao.                       | 12. Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar.          |
| 8. Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu. | 13. „ R. Srinivasa Ayyangar.             |
| 9. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo.         | 14. „ T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar.          |
| 10. Rao Bahadur C. B. Rama Rao.           | 15. Rev. W. Meston.                      |
| 11. Rao Sahib U. Rama Rao.                | 16. Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.         |
|   | 17. Rao Bahadur T. Namburumal Chettiyar. |

Noes.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1. The hon. the Raja of Panagal.           | 23. Rao Bahadur A. Ramayya Punja.                |
| 2. „ Bai Bahadur K. Venkatreddi Nayudu.    | 24. Mr. W. P. A. Saundarapandiya Nadar.          |
| 3. Mr. K. Ramunni Menon.                   | 25. „ R. K. Shanmukham Chettiyar.                |
| 4. „ E. Periyannayakam.                    | 26. „ K. Sitarama Reddi.                         |
| 5. Rao Sahib T. C. Tangavelu Pillai.       | 27. „ S. Somasundaram Pillai.                    |
| 6. Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar.             | 28. „ A. Subbarayadu.                            |
| 7. „ S. T. Shanmukham Pillai.              | 29. Rao Bahadur C. Venkata Ranga Reddi.          |
| 8. S. R. Y. Ankinedu Prasad Bahadur.       | 30. Mr. S. Muthumanikkachari.                    |
| 9. Mr. R. Appaswami Nayudu.                | 31. „ A. T. Palmer.                              |
| 10. Rao Bahadur V. Appaswami Vandayar.     | 32. „ M. Ratnaswami.                             |
| 11. Diwan Bahadur C. Arunachala Mudaliyar. | 33. The Raja of Ramnad.                          |
| 12. Sir P. Tyagaraya Chettiyar.            | 34. Sri Meka V. Apparao Bahadur.                 |
| 13. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar.       | 35. The Zamindar of Mandasa.                     |
| 14. Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi.                | 36. Mr. K. Prabhakaran Tampan.                   |
| 15. Rao Bahadur T. N. Sivagnanam Pillai.   | 37. Abbas Ali Khan Bahadur.                      |
| 16. „ O. Tanikachala Chettiyar.            | 38. Khan Sahib Saiyid Ibrahim Ravuttar.          |
| 17. Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar.        | 39. Saiyid Diwan Abdul-Razaak Sahib.             |
| 18. „ B. Moniswami Nayudu.                 | 40. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Sadulla Badesha Sahib. |
| 19. „ P. C. Muthu Chettiyar.               | 41. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib.           |
| 20. „ M. Narayanaswami Reddi.              | 42. Rao Sahib M. C. Madurai Pillai.              |
| 21. Rao Bahadur C. Natesa Mudaliyar.       | 43. Mr. G. Vandanam.                             |
| 22. Mr. C. Ponnuswami Nayudu.              |  |

Seventeen voted for and 43 against the amendment.

The motion was declared lost.

4-30 p.m. The following identical amendments fell through:—

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—

25. *Omit the word 'Pro-Chancellor'.*

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—

26. *Omit the word 'Pro-Chancellor'.*

The following amendment was not moved and was therefore deemed to have been withdrawn:—

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—

27. *For the words 'and Vice-Chancellor' substitute the words 'Vice-Chancellor and Registrar'.*

Clause 3 was put, passed and added to the Bill.

Clause 4 was put, passed and added to the Bill.



31st January 1923]

Clause 5.

Sub-clause (1).

The following amendments were not moved :—

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—

28. *Omit the word 'sole' occurring before the word 'ground'.*

Rai Sahib E. C. M. MASCARENHAS :—

28-A. *Add the following as a proviso :—*

'Provided that nothing in this section shall be deemed to prevent religious instruction being given in the manner prescribed by the ordinances to those not unwilling to receive it by persons (whether teachers of the university or not) approved for that purpose by the Syndicate'.

The following amendments were deemed to have been withdrawn, the hon. Members not being in their places :—

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

29. *In item (c) after the word 'offence' insert the words 'under the Indian Penal Code'.*

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—

30. *Add the following as sub-clause (3) :—*

'(3) There shall be no religious instruction or prayer in any affiliated or constituent college of the university or in any first or second-grade college which the students of that college are compulsorily required to attend.'

Clause 5 was put, passed and added to the Bill.

*New clause after clause 5.*

Diwan Bahadur L. A. GOVINDARAGHAVA AYYAR :—"Sir, I beg to move—

31. *Insert the following as clause 6 and re-number the subsequent clauses :—*

'6. It shall be the duty of the university to have constituent colleges sufficient to ensure the admission to them of students, eligible under the Regulations and Ordinances, as the case may be, prescribed for the purpose for admission, and seeking admission, to qualify for degrees or other academical distinctions in the faculties included in the university.'

"I venture to say, Sir, that this clause has been suggested by me for the purpose of giving full effect to the basic principles of the Bill. The discussion that has gone on with respect to the desirability of having university centres and university colleges has accentuated the need for this proposal; and I wish the House will bear it in mind, when deliberating upon this clause, that, so far as Madras is concerned, under the new conditions that will necessarily be brought into existence for the purpose of giving effect to this Bill, colleges in Madras will be of great excellence and of superior educational value. It is, therefore, natural that those who have passed the necessary

[Mr. L. A. Govindaraghava Ayyar] [31st January 1923]

*New clause after clause 5—cont.*

examinations which will enable them to get into the university course should think of getting into the constituent colleges which will become part of the university that will hereafter be installed. If the need, therefore, is already existent for room being found to all who are qualified to take the university course in the Madras colleges, that need will become more imperative and more reasonable in future when these colleges are placed on the basis that will be assigned to them by this Bill when it becomes law. Therefore, Sir, what I want is that there ought not to be any kind of difficulty, under which any of these students who want to enter the university course in Madras through the constituent colleges should suffer for want of room in these constituent colleges. I do not want, Sir, that so far as the qualification for entrance goes, it should be an arbitrary one. I want in this clause that only persons who are rendered eligible by the Regulations and Ordinances for admission into the constituent colleges should be assured of room in them. Now, the House will have noticed, and that is a point which I wish also to be considered, that under clause 27 the power of the university to affiliate a college to itself within the ten-mile radius is taken away, so that the position is that so far as the ten-mile radius is concerned, we have only the constituent colleges and no other college to which students eligible for admission into the university course can possibly go. If a student is qualified for admission and if he happens to be within this ten-mile radius, I venture to think that it is but proper that he must have an opportunity of getting into the university. I am sure the House will recognize that one of the fundamental assumptions that ought, at any rate, to rule measures such as this is that there ought to be no inequality in the access that is given to educational opportunity. Everybody who is qualified according to the rules—make the rules as rigid as you please—but everybody who is qualified according to the rules, must be given an opportunity of benefiting by the experience and the teaching and the examination that these institutions can give. All that this clause seeks is to make it a duty on the part of the university to attach colleges to itself so as to provide room for persons who are likely to be entrants. Now either there is enough room in these constituent colleges for all possible entrants or there is not. According to the clause I propose the number of those entrants has to be decided by reference to their satisfying the necessary tests imposed upon them. If the present colleges are enough to admit them, then there can be no quarrel over this clause and it may very well get in. Let us suppose, on the other hand, that the present colleges or the constituent colleges that are to come into existence are not enough. The question, then arises whether it will be fair to prevent colleges being affiliated but still not find room for these persons. The only argument that can possibly be urged is this: although they bring themselves within the ten-mile radius, although they are qualified to take the university course, still admission may be refused to them because there is no accommodation available, with the result either they should go without the benefit of a university course or they must go outside the ten-mile radius and get themselves admitted into other colleges of the Presidency. Now, I would ask this House whether this is a reasonable condition to be imposed upon the students who are qualified to get into the university, who are anxious to have all the benefits of a constituent college and who are within the ten-mile



31st January 1923] [Mr. L. A. Govindaraghava Ayyar]

*New clause after clause 5—cont.*

radius and therefore persons whose needs must first have to be met. For these reasons, I beg to propose this clause for the acceptance of this House."

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"I beg to second the amendment."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"Sir, I am surprised that the hon. Mr. Govindaraghava Ayyar who was speaking so much for the betterment of the position of the mufassal colleges should have brought forward a clause like this. At the present moment, the experience of the mufassal colleges has been that it is only the refuse of the city colleges that go to the mufassal colleges. Both in quality and in quantity the mufassal colleges have been suffering a great deal and we are trying to attract more students to the mufassal colleges. Now, Sir, the result of accepting this amendment will be that provision will have to be made for all the students that come to Madras, so that practically we shall be denuding the mufassal colleges of all their students."

Diwan Bahadur L. A. GOVINDARAGHAVA AYYAR :—"I do not know where my hon. friend gets that."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"I am speaking from my experience and from what I have heard from most of the colleges in the mufassal. Students in the mufassal, as soon as they pass their examination first apply for seats to the colleges in Madras. When admission is refused in the Madras colleges, they think of joining mufassal colleges. The result of providing for all the students who apply to the city colleges will naturally be that the colleges in the mufassal will all be denuded of their students. The amendment, if accepted, will be a direct blow to all the mufassal institutions in this Presidency. Well, Sir, it is well known and we have been hearing it from all sides of this House yesterday and to-day, that even at the present moment, the position of the mufassal colleges is rather weak and that they are not in a position to compete with the colleges in Madras. In spite of the view of those gentlemen in Madras who claim that this Bill is not going to make any change between the two sets of colleges, we, mufassalites, think that this Bill is going to make a large change and is going to put the colleges in the mufassal at a disadvantage. That being so, if this amendment is accepted, even those students who, on account of the considerations, mentioned in the first instance apply to the mufassal colleges for admission will hereafter apply only to the city colleges, with the result that all the mufassal colleges will have to be closed down. That is not a thing, I suppose, which the hon. mover contemplates."

"There is another point of view from which we have to look at this question. At the present moment out of all the university students who number about 12,000 only 4,000 are in the city. This clause wants that provision should be made for the remaining 8,000 students also for coming to the city colleges, if they so choose."

Diwan Bahadur L. A. GOVINDARAGHAVA AYYAR :—"As a matter of personal explanation, Sir, I never asked for that."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"If all the students in the Presidency propose to come to Madras, facilities have to be made for them and I think it is not a practicable thing at all. And even taking the B.A. class alone, about 60 per cent of the boys reading

[Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar] [31st January 1923]

*New clause after clause 5—cont.*

in that class are in the mufassal. How is provision going to be made for all the 60 per cent? That is to say about one and a half times the present accommodation will have to be added for these students. We have had in the Finance Committee only quite recently an estimate for increasing the accommodation for chemistry teaching in the Presidency College. Apparently, a few more boys are going to be taught in that class and, as a result, an estimate involving 5 lakhs has to be passed. The buildings are said to be completed and some more estimates will be coming up in course of time. Now, Sir, are we going to make provision for those additional boys who are expected to come to Madras? It is not practical politics to say that any such provision as is proposed in this clause will, either now or in the near future, be possible. If this matter is going to be seriously taken up, we may drop everything and go home. I do not think, Sir, that, either as a practical measure, or in the interests of the mufassal colleges, a provision like this can be accepted by this House. So, I am constrained to oppose this motion."

Mr. S. SOMASUNDARAM PILLAI:—"Mr. President, on the very face of it, this appears to me to be an impossible proposition. If it is said that even when there is sufficient accommodation the mufassal students are refused admission and join the Madras colleges, then we can understand the argument. But the proposal is that students should be admitted to the constituent colleges whether there is accommodation or not."

Diwan Bahadur L. A. GOVINDARAGHAVA AYYAR:—"I never suggested that all students who came from the mufassal should be admitted. In fact, more than once, in my opening remarks, I have stated that it is students who are already within the ten-mile radius and who have qualified themselves for entrance into the university that have necessarily to be provided for, and it is unreasonable to ask them to go to mufassal colleges. I may also mention that I have clearly stated in the clause that persons are eligible for admission into constituent colleges under the Regulations and Ordinances, and there is nothing to prevent a Regulation or Ordinance being made which will prevent students from any mufassal college from being admitted into a constituent college in Madras."

Mr. S. SOMASUNDARAM PILLAI:—"What I understand by the wording of the resolution is that sufficient accommodation may be provided by the university for all the students who are declared eligible. Suppose there is no fund in the university, then sufficient accommodation cannot be provided for. But this will be possible only in one way, that is, if college classes and hostels are devised in the open air under the canopy of Heaven. With these words, I differ from my hon. friend, the mover, and strongly oppose the amendment."

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAYAR:—"Mr. President, I can very well sympathise with the object which the hon. mover has in view in moving this new clause. But if he really wants that students residing within the ten-mile limit should be allowed to join any constituent college in Madras, he should make that very clear by slightly altering his amendment. If that is made clear, nobody will have any valid objection. But, as it is, his idea is to allow all students qualified for admission to be accommodated in one of the



31st January 1923] [Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udayar]

*New clause after clause 5—cont.*

constituent colleges. So, if the alteration suggested is made and the amendment made clear, I have no quarrel whatever with him. But if that is not done, I should certainly, in the interests of mufassal centres, enter my protest against this.

“Nor can I brook the statement made by my hon. friend, Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar, who said that the refuse of the students join the mufassal colleges. I can assure the House, Sir, that it is really intelligent students that are to be found in the mufassal colleges. If they were not intelligent they would not do well in the public examinations; but they very often top the list, and the hon. Member, the Director of Public Instruction, will, I am sure, bear me out in this. Several times we find mufassal candidates carrying off prizes, medals and distinctions, and, surely, to say that the refuse of the students join the mufassal colleges would be a travesty of facts.”

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“I only meant that those who were refused here sought admission in the mufassal colleges. I did not mean refuse of the students.”

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAYAR :—“I am sorry that it is only a mistake of grammar which has given rise to this confusion.

“And secondly, Sir, an amendment has been accepted by the House recommending certain university centres. The Saddler Commission report also pointed out the disadvantage to the mufassal which might result from the constitution of teaching universities in Calcutta and Dacca, and they said that by systematic aid and encouragement the mufassal colleges ought to be brought to a higher degree of efficiency so that they might compare favourably with the constituent colleges of the teaching university. Therefore, there is an urgent need, and it is felt by everybody, that the hon. the Minister for Education should take early steps to encourage mufassal institutions by solid and substantial contributions to rise to a high grade of efficiency and ward off or avoid any inconvenience or disadvantage of the nature complained of by my hon. friend.”

Mr. A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—“Mr. President, I beg to oppose this motion. I think, Sir, it will help the House if we are to understand what is the exact position with regard to the students in the colleges of Madras. The statistics relating to students in the B.A. class in the colleges of Madras show that about 1,200 students are now reading in Madras, of whom roughly 110 students belong to the city of Madras or the ten-mile radius. If my hon. friend's object is to ensure that all the 110 students should have admittance to the constituent colleges of Madras I daresay nobody will have any objection, and my friend will realize that it is a proposition which has only to be put forward to be accepted. But he wishes that all students who want to come to Madras and have admission . . .”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“May I ask the hon. Member whether the figure given is for Arts colleges only or whether it includes professional colleges also?”

Mr. A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—“I was referring to Arts colleges. So far as I can see, the hon. Member's speech gives colour to the impression that every student who wants to enter into one of the constituent colleges should have the right of admission. But how this is going to be enforced he

[Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar] [31st January 1923]

*New clause after clause 5—cont.*

has not given us any inkling of. Is it a pious wish, is it an expression of hope, or is it something more than that? Apart from that, my friend will see that if such a positive and obligatory duty is cast on the University, the question will be largely one of funds, and he has not stated wherefrom the University is to get funds. My friends from the mufassal have already pointed out that a provision like this, if accepted, would cut at the very root of mufassal education. If it is understood that any student who wants admission to a constituent college should be provided with accommodation, it will certainly denude the mufassal colleges of all their students. If only in the interests of the mufassal colleges, this is a proposal which cannot be accepted by this House, and I am sure that if it is only a question of providing for Madras students proper, that is amply provided for by the existing colleges. With these words I certainly oppose this amendment and wish that it may not be accepted by this House."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" I also wish to associate myself with those who opposed this motion. I quite sympathise with the spirit underlying it, but I oppose it solely on the ground of practical difficulty. We have heard to-day a great deal in this House about the equality or inequality of colleges in Madras and colleges in the mufassal. It has been stated, and I believe reasonably too, that the mufassal colleges are doing a great deal of useful work, but in spite of that there is an impression—and I believe an impression founded on reason—that on the whole the quality of teaching imparted in the colleges in the city of Madras is better than the quality of teaching imparted in mufassal colleges. No doubt, there are very good colleges in the mufassal, for instance, St. Joseph's College, Trichinopoly, Trivandrum College and several other colleges, where first-class higher education is imparted to students. But apart from the quality of actual instruction that is being imparted, those students who come to Madras do so in order to widen their experience and knowledge of things. For that reason, there is a general tendency on the part of the parents and guardians who can afford it to send their sons and wards to colleges in the city. If effect be given to this resolution, it must necessarily follow that the university should build more colleges than are existing now in Madras. It is a well-known fact that immediately after the examinations are over, there is a general crowding of such students as can afford to live in Madras, and it is also a well-known fact that colleges in the city of Madras find it extremely difficult and very often impossible to give accommodation to those students. So that, if this resolution be passed, as soon as the Bill becomes law, the university will be bound to erect the necessary buildings and provide the necessary appliances for giving efficient instruction to those students that seek admission in the Madras colleges. It is impossible to do this, on account of the financial difficulties.

" My friend referred to boys who are residing in the ten-mile limit. As a matter of fact, in this resolution itself, there is no such thing. The resolution is very wide and wants to ensure admission to those who are qualified for it. For these reasons, I oppose the amendment."

Diwan Bahadur L. A. GOVINDARAGHAVA AYYAR :—" I am afraid, Sir, that there has been considerable misunderstanding as to the scope of my resolution. In the first place, let me state what



31st January 1923] [Mr. L. A. Govindaraghava Ayyar]

*New clause after clause 5—cont.*

exactly my amendment means. The amendment says that if according to the Ordinances and Regulations any person becomes eligible to be admitted and seeks admission to the University course, he should not be refused admission by any constituent college. That is all that my amendment suggests.

“Two objections have been raised to this. One is that I have not made it clear that only persons within the ten-mile radius should be the persons who should not be refused admission. And, secondly, it was stated that the amendment as it stood would have the effect of depleting the mufassal colleges and make their efficiency and power much less than what they are at present. Now, Sir, all that I wanted to suggest was that as the rules would stand without this clause, there was a possibility of students even within the ten-mile radius being refused admission, and it could not be said in their case that they were not entitled to admission or that the refusal would not work hardship or injustice to them. It has been stated that there are the mufassal colleges. There are a number of them, which send up students only for the Intermediate Examination. They are not first-grade colleges, and there is no reason why those students who have passed from these colleges, if they are eligible and prepared to incur the necessary cost, should not get into the constituent colleges. Therefore the position is this: You have to give every body who wants it a chance of qualifying himself. You must give him such a chance as that. If the object is to merely run the present show as if it is the correct show under the new Act, there is really no meaning in the new measure that is going to be introduced. What is wanted is that there should be a machinery employed which will serve really the functions of a teaching university. And it should have constituent colleges. And the university within the ten-mile radius has no power of affiliation supposing that the clause relating to it is passed. So that it comes to this, that there is a possibility of a good number of persons, who will be otherwise eligible for admission to the University, being refused admission by the constituent colleges on account of want of room in them. Now, Sir, so far as the constituent colleges are concerned, I have stated . . .”

Diwan Bahadur Sir T. DESIKA ACHARIYAR (*from the Chair*):—“Will the hon. Member take a long time to finish his remarks?”

Diwan Bahadur L. A. GOVINDARAGHAVA AYYAR:—“I may take five minutes, Sir.”

Diwan Bahadur Sir T. DESIKA ACHARIYAR (*from the Chair*):—“Then the House will adjourn to meet again to-morrow and the hon. Member will then continue his speech.”

The House then adjourned at 5-10 p.m. to meet at 11 a.m. the next day.

L. D. SWAMIKANNU,  
*Secretary to the Legislative Council.*